

**THE FRENCH INFLUENCE
ON THE
WESTERN ARMENIAN
RENAISSANCE
1843-1915**

by

JAMES ETMEKJIAN

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES
QUEENS COLLEGE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

TWAYNE PUBLISHERS, INC.

NEW YORK

1964

To those who gave not only their talents but also their lives to rekindle the torch of their ancient culture with new brilliance in spite of almost insuperable obstacles.

© *Copyright 1964 by James Etmekjian*

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 63-19367

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

Preface

The French Influence on the Western Armenian Renaissance came into being as a doctoral dissertation at Brown University. Our aim was neither to extol the virtues of French literature nor to belittle the achievement of the Armenians. Admired by the whole civilized world, French literature does not need the eulogy of our modest pen. On the other hand, to feel the impact of foreign ideas is not a sign of inferiority. To shut oneself off from outside influences is to insure inbred mediocrity. Moreover, political, economic, philosophical, literary, and artistic currents have no respect for national boundaries, even when those boundaries, happen to enclose the Turkish Empire. French literature in all its greatness has not spurned classical, Italian, German, English, Spanish, and Russian influences. Nor have Shakespeare, Cervantes, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Voltaire, Lamartine, or Hugo avoided the use of materials and techniques developed by others. We believe with Sainte-Beuve that knowing all the elements which contribute toward the formation of a man and his work does not detract from his value but rather that it contributes toward a better understanding and fuller appreciation of his genius.

Armenian history and literature are known to very few. It was our opinion that, in dealing with the question of influences, we should be able to point out more clearly a phase of French culture which receives little attention from the average scholar and, at the same time, to bring to light certain aspects of Armenian life which are unknown to non-Armenians. We hope that, in the process, we have raised issues and problems which may stimulate others to try to prove or disprove.

In this book, we are dealing with the Renaissance in Western Armenia, that is that section of the country which was annexed by the Turks through conquest. Eastern Armenia comprises what is now known as the Armenian S. S. R. and that portion of historical Armenia which has become part of Iran. While both sectors underwent a renaissance in the nineteenth century, the circumstances and influences which affected them were different. We chose to study the Western Renaissance because we were approaching the problem from the point of view of the French influence.

We have been faced with certain difficulties during our research. The first of these has been the scarcity of primary sources dealing with the period 1843 to 1883. The writings of certain authors were available, and they have been used, but journalistic literature dealing with contemporary questions was completely lacking. It has been necessary, therefore, to depend upon secondary sources in that aspect of the study. The situation was much more favorable with regard to the period after 1883, as the frequent references to contemporary journals throughout the text will attest.

A second problem has been that of the Armenian script. All titles except *Masis*, *Anahid*, *Shirag*, and *Vosdan* have been translated. It has not always been easy to give a precise translation of a title which would be meaningful in English, which means that occasional departures from the original were necessary. Repetition of the original in Armenian script would not have solved the problem of exactness for those who do not read Armenian. To have put transliterated Armenian titles in parentheses after every translation would have made the text more cumbersome and distracting. At the same time, to have ignored the Armenian titles completely would have created a real void for the interested reader. Hence, we have given all Armenian titles in the bibliography in transliterated form.

A third difficulty has been that of transliteration, itself. This problem arises whenever one attempts to represent in

the native characters sounds which exist in a foreign language. It becomes especially thorny when the two languages involved are English, with its twenty-six-letter alphabet, and Armenian, with its thirty-eight letters.

There are two schools of thought concerning the transliteration of Armenian words in foreign languages—the classical and the modern. The classicists insist that transliteration should follow the traditional pattern established many centuries ago, soon after the invention of the Armenian alphabet. The modernists maintain that it should be done according to the modern sound systems of the two languages involved.

Armenian has evolved during the many centuries of its existence. At the time of its invention, the Armenian alphabet represented the sounds of the contemporary language (fifth century A.D.). In time, changes took place in pronunciation, and some of the letters no longer represented the same sounds. Ultimately, too, there developed the eastern and western dialects, with many subdivisions, and in the western dialect the evolution of certain consonants went even farther than in the eastern. To complicate the situation, there exist today certain Armenian proper names which have entered the annals of other nations. Through repeated use, they have acquired one or more commonly used forms. The modern writer has to choose between the traditional and the modern forms.

In our opinion, at a given time, the purpose of transliteration in general is to help the non-native to approximate as closely as possible the current sounds and sound patterns of the language in question (the target language). The English-speaking reader, for instance, will naturally give to the letters of his alphabet the sounds that he normally gives to them. Unless he is versed or interested in linguistics, he will be neither able nor inclined to stop to puzzle out what was the historical sound represented by *p*, *k*, *t*, or any other letter. Thus, he will pronounce the word for red *karmir*,

just the way it looks rather than *garmir*, as is the case in western Armenian.

In this book, we are dealing with Western Armenian. Therefore, we have tried to approximate Western Armenian sounds in our transliteration. We have assigned a single letter to each sound wherever possible. Thus, *u* represents the *oo* in *moon* without the prolongation which results from the presence of the *n*. The Armenian graphic representation of this sound consists of two letters neither of which can be represented by any English letter under all circumstances. The same is true of the fifth letter of the Armenian alphabet. In initial position plus consonant, it is pronounced *ye*. In all positions followed by a vowel, except one, it is pronounced *y*. In medial position followed by a consonant, it is like the *e* in *let*. No single letter would be adequate to represent it in all situations.

In the transliteration of well-known historical names, we have given their traditional forms followed in parentheses by their spellings according to the modern Western Armenian pronunciation. The names of the modern Armenian authors Adontz, Tchobanian, Pastermadjian, and Thorosian, transliterated by the authors, themselves, according to French phonology, have been rendered by Adont's, Chobanian, P'astermajian, and T'orosian. In the end bibliography, they are listed alphabetically according to the English transliteration, but their French versions are indicated in parentheses. Sarkissian and Der Nersessian, names already associated with publications in English, have remained intact.

We do not pretend to have found a perfect solution to the problem. We can only hope that we have made the reading of Armenian words somewhat less puzzling.

We have quoted much material from French and Armenian sources, but except for very few instances we have translated it. The footnotes and bibliography make the original language of the quotation amply clear.

For the historical portion of this book, we have relied heavily on Leo's *History of the Armenian People*, volumes I and III. It is the most detailed and reliable general history with which we are acquainted. Grousset's *Histoire de l'Arménie* is also a scholarly work. It is a good complement to Leo on the period that it covers (from the beginning to 1071). Adont's *Histoire d'Arménie*, dealing with the pre-Armenian period, and Macler's two volumes (*Autour de l'Arménie* and *Quatre conférences sur l'Arménie*), dealing with historical and cultural matters, help to give a clear picture of the history and culture of Armenia. In the field of Armenian linguistics, Ajařian is still considered the greatest authority. Therefore, we have drawn freely from his various works. Alboyajian, a very thorough and conscientious scholar, has served as our principal source for the history of Armenian education prior to the first half of the nineteenth century with his *History of the Armenian School* and articles scattered in dailies and periodicals. In the literary field, Oshagan (*Panorama of Western Armenian Literature*, five volumes), Apeghian (*History of Old Armenian Literature*, two volumes), Zaminian (*History of Old Armenian Literature*), Janashian (*History of Modern Armenian Literature*, Volume I), A. Arp'iarian (*History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*), and Asadur (*Silouettes*) have been the chief sources. The periodical *Masis* and the dailies *Orient* and *Fatherland* have furnished a wealth of information on contemporary social, religious, intellectual, and artistic life.

In closing, we should like to thank Mr. Vahan Topalian, who opened wide the doors of the Armenian Cultural Foundation (Boston), with the richest collection of Armenian books and periodicals in the United States. It was the existence of this foundation and the goodwill of Mr. Topalian that encouraged us to undertake a study which would otherwise have been impossible. We wish to thank Professor Harcourt Brown of the French Department of Brown

University, our thesis advisor, for his suggestions concerning methods of research, and for his strong encouragement, with other members of the department and examining committee, to make every effort to get this book published. Finally, we wish to thank all the individuals in the United States and abroad who helped with information and materials in the completion of this work.

Contents

PART I

THE ANTECEDENTS

Chapter 1

- The Struggle of Cultural Elements from the Beginning of Armenian History to the End of the Fourth Century 23

Urantians, Hittites, Assyrians, Babylonians, Armenians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, and Romans on Armenian soil.

Chapter 2

- Importance of the Religious Conflict after the Advent of Christianity 35

Syrian and Greek Christianity vs. Persian Zoroastrianism.

Chapter 3

- Contact with Western Europe Eleventh to Seventeenth Centuries 52

The Crusades; transformation of Armenian social and political institutions; Catholicism; Armenian printing; Latinization.

Chapter 4

- The Reawakening 68

Efforts in direction of intellectual and material improvement; founding of the Mkhitarist' order; its contribution to the reawakening.

PART II

THE WESTERN ARMENIAN RENAISSANCE

Chapter 1

- The Political, Social, and Economic Condition
of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 79
- Discriminatory laws against Christians; French
cultural hegemony in the Turkish capital; T'an-
zimat'.

Chapter 2

- The Renaissance Generation 94
- Armenian students in France and Italy; bonds
uniting the Renaissance Generation; members
of the Renaissance Generation.

Chapter 3

- The Armenian National Constitution and the
Armenian Movement 115
- Rising influence of the middle and lower class
in the life of the Armenian community; the
National Constitution; the Armenian national
movement; agitation for reforms; violence;
massacres.

Chapter 4

- The Armenian Press 136
- The first Armenian newspaper; the Armenian
press in Turkey; *Masis*; utilitarianism of the
press.

Chapter 5

- Development of the Vernacular as a Literary
Language 150

Classical Armenian as a literary language; rise of the vernacular; role of the press; role of the Armenian theatre; role of the French language.

Chapter 6

The French Language in Armenian Schools 162

Growth of the Armenian parish school; place of the French language in schools; unsuccessful reaction against French.

Chapter 7

The French Penetration into Armenian Life 175

Armenian manners; problem of morals; French political and social activity; décolleté literature; Armenian salons.

PART III

THE FRENCH INFLUENCE IN ARMENIAN LITERATURE

Chapter 1

The Romantic Movement 195

The Armenian theatre; classicism and modernism in the theatre; elements in Armenian Romanticism; Alishan and Turian; the Armenian novel.

Chapter 2

From Romanticism to Realism 214

Elements in Armenian Realism; role of the press; Arp'iarian, Zohrab, Pashalian, and others; the French influence.

Chapter 3

Some Instances of the French Influence on Armenian Realists	227
--	------------

Zohrab and the French masters; Arp'iarian and
Daudet.

Chapter 4

The Evolution of Literary Theory	239
---	------------

Concept of the role of the writer; Armenian
feminism; morality in literature; provincial litera-
ture vs. literature of the Capital; art for art's
sake.

Chapter 5

Conclusion	255
-------------------	------------

Bibliography	262
---------------------	------------

Appendix	273
-----------------	------------

Index	283
--------------	------------

GUIDE TO TRANSLITERATION, PRONUNCIATION, AND STRESS

- a — the a in *far*
- ay — the i in *Hi!*
- dz — the sounds of *d* and *z* are combined into one
- ě — the e in *term*
- e — the e in *let*
- ē — the e in *let* in final position
- g — the g in *game* regardless of the position or the letters which follow
- gh — the French uvular *r* (cf. *frère*)
- kh — the German *ch* (cf. *ach*) or Spanish *j* (cf. *jardín*)
- i — the i in *machine*, except in the endings of surnames, when it is pronounced *y*
- k — a sound intermediate between hard *g* and *k*, similar to the *c* in the French word *crayon*
- k' — the *k* in *king*
- o — the o in *go*
- p — a sound intermediate between *b* and *p*, similar to the French *p* in *présent* or the English *p* in *spell*
- p' — a strongly aspirated *p*, like the *p* in the English word *paint*
- ř — a sound similar to the Spanish initial *r* (cf. *rey*)
- s — the s in *sing* in all positions
- t — a sound intermediate between *d* and *t*, similar to the first *t* in the French word *tout*
- t' — the *t* in *take*

tj — a softly pronounced *t* is combined with *j* into a single sound softer than *ch*

tz — a softly pronounced *t* is combined with *z* into a single sound

t's — a strongly aspirated *t* is combined with *s* into a single sound

u — the *oo* in *moon*

ü — the French *u* (cf. *du, su*) or the German *ü*

zh — the *s* in *pleasure*

All other letters and combinations of letters are pronounced as in English.

Armenian words are generally stressed on the last syllable, but the following exceptions should be noted:

A. Family names ending in *-ian* are stressed on the penult.

Baronian

Pashalian

1. When the definite article *ě* is added, the stress shifts to *ian*, but this is still the penult.

Baronianě

Pashalianě

2. When a case ending is added, the stress shifts to the final syllable.

Baronianin

Pashalianin

Baronianen

Pashalianen

B. The addition of the definite article *ě* and the possessive suffixes (articles) *-s*, *-t*, and *-n(ě)* to monosyllabic nouns creates two syllable nouns stressed on the first syllable. The additions have no effect on polysyllabic words.

dun house

shun dog

duně the house

shuně the dog

dun(ěs) my house

shun(ě)s my dog

dun(ě)t your house

shun(ě)t your dog

(ir) *duně* his (her)

(ir) *shuně* his (her) dog

house

In pronouncing words beginning with an *s* followed by *b*, *d*, *g*, or *z* followed by *k*, it is necessary to pronounce an *ě* at the beginning (cf. *spell*, *stay*, and *straight* in English).

šbidag – ěšbidag	white
sdibel – ěsdibel	to compel, urge
sgsil – ěsgsil	to begin
zkal – ězkal	to feel

If some other consonant follows *s*, *sh*, or *z*, or if the word begins with another consonant, it is necessary to pronounce an *ě* *after* the first consonant.

skal – sĕkal	to mourn
slanal – sĕlanal	to soar
shnchel – shĕnchel	to breathe
zrah – zĕrah	armour
Mrmrian – Mĕrmĕrian	(surname)
Mgrdich – Mĕgĕrdich	(first name)
Fndk'lian – Fĕndĕk'lian	(surname)

PART I

THE ANTECEDENTS



The Struggle of Cultural Elements from the Beginning of Armenian History to the End of the Fourth Century

"It has been the destiny of the Armenian people to wage a struggle against foreign nations for the protection of their physical and spiritual life. The inner meaning of our history lies principally in that struggle, and it is also that struggle of which our literature has generally been the expression." So writes M. Apeghian¹ in his *History of Old Armenian Literature*.² If the reader interprets this statement in the narrow sense, he will fail to understand one of the most important aspects of Armenian history, namely: the struggle for cultural supremacy over the land of Armenia from the period of its earliest inhabitants to the present. There was a battle, not only of armies around and over this historic land, but also of ideas, customs, art, literature, political and social organization, and every other aspect of human life. While all nations have been subjected to many cultural currents throughout their history, it seems safe to say that few have seen so many armies and so many cultures clash over their homeland, because few have had the strategic geographical position that the Armenian nation has occupied.

When we speak of Armenia, we refer to that plateau in

Asia Minor which lies between thirty-seven and forty-one and a half degrees north latitude and thirty-six and forty-eight degrees east longitude. On the west, the Euphrates River serves as its boundary. On the north, it is the Pontus Mountains, the Lesser Caucasus, and the Cyrus (Gur) River, which separate it from its neighbors. On the east, it is bounded by the valley which lies immediately west of the Caspian Sea; while on the southeast one finds Iran; on the south, the Carduchian Mountains and the Armenian Taurus; and on the southwest, the Amanus and Taurus mountain ranges.³

Cappadocia, lying between Pontus on the north and the Taurus Mountains on the south, and extending westward from the Euphrates to thirty-two degrees east longitude, was regarded as Armenian territory as early as the sixth century B.C., according to an inscription of Darius I. In the fifth century B.C., Herodotus implies the same thing when he states that the Halis River passes through Armenia. It was not until 190 A.D. that the designations Greater Armenia and Lesser Armenia came into being to distinguish between Armenia proper and Cappadocia respectively.⁴

A quick glance at this little corner of the world will show its strategic position between East and West, North and South. It is as if the Armenian Plateau were intended to serve as a bridge between Europe and Asia. Possessing military power, Armenia could also have been a bulwark of defense against one or the other. A bridge it remained, but the aggressive policy of conquest and absorption pursued by her neighbors never allowed her to acquire sufficient strength to stop the uncivilized hordes which moved repeatedly and relentlessly from the wide expanses of Central Asia to the more confined but attractive surroundings of Asia Minor. In the struggle between East and West, European armies marched through Armenia to attack their eastern rivals. If the tide went in the other direction, it was the eastern hosts which trampled the country under foot.

When Greeks, Romans, and Persians had spent themselves in constant warfare, the Arabs suddenly swept forward from their southern deserts to inundate Asia Minor and to forge themselves a mighty empire.⁵ Turks,⁶ Tatars,⁷ and other Mongolian tribes spilled over into this strategic territory, and made themselves masters of the land and the people. In time of peace, the armies gave way to merchant caravans which carried on a most profitable trade between East and West and continued the constant stream of activity which maintained and increased contacts between the peoples of these two sectors of the world.

For more than three thousand years, the pattern has repeated itself with monotonous regularity, and the endless influx of peoples and cultural elements has left a lasting, if at times subtle, impression on all phases of Armenian life. In fact, it could not fail to modify the Armenian character, itself. Even before they appeared on the Armenian Plateau, the Armenians had associated, mingled, and, possibly, absorbed other peoples and other cultural elements. It is well to remember that in addition to the time spent in Thrace, they had spent some six hundred years on the ruins of the Hittite Empire and been subjected to its highly developed civilization.⁸ Then, no sooner had they overrun Urartu, than they came under the domination of the Medes. According to Xenophon, this consisted of nothing more than paying tribute and furnishing troops in times of war,⁹ but when the Persians replaced the Medes on the Asiatic scene, the control was more stringent, with Armenia being reduced to the level of a satrapy. The Iranian influence

... began to operate very early, even at the time when the Armenians had not crossed over to the eastern banks of the Euphrates. Thereafter, no other influence affected as much the Armenian people, who had developed with the mingling of the Hittite-Aryan cultures. The Persian language and religious philosophy left deep impressions among the Armenians, as well as among other nations.¹⁰

This influence must have been appreciable, indeed, if Armenian women of the humble class were able to talk in Persian to Xenophon's Greeks through an interpreter who spoke the language.¹¹ It must not be assumed, however, that Armenian culture was merely an appendage of the Iranian. The Armenians had been quite conscious of the special character of their heritage and were determined to preserve and pass it on to posterity. They were able to retain their language and to make it the language of the country they conquered, even under adverse political conditions.

It remained for Alexander's conquest of Asia (331 B.C.) to re-establish contact between the Armenians and the Greeks. Many hundreds of years had elapsed since the Armenians had left Thrace. New philosophical, religious, and artistic ideas and practices had developed in Greece. The young king's expedition served to bring them to his Asiatic neighbors. While the impact of Greek civilization was strongest on the shores of the Mediterranean, and while Persia, representing the Asiatic point of view, resisted strongly the march of Greek ideas, nevertheless the Greek language penetrated into all parts of Asia Minor, including Armenia.¹² Yet the penetration of the Hellenic spirit and mind failed to produce any kind of literature among the Armenians (or the Persians), first, because they were still in the process of assimilating and being assimilated, and secondly, because the Armenian language was still more than seven hundred years away from an alphabet of its own.

The absence of a written language was a serious problem for a serious king like Artaxias (Ardashes, 190-145 B.C.), who was trying to unify his country. After having decreed that thenceforth Armenian was the official language to be used by his non-Armenian, as well as Armenian, subjects, he seems to have tried to give his people a written language by causing his inscriptions to be written in Armenian, using the Aramaic letters.¹³

It was during this dynasty, half a century after Artaxias' death, that large-scale contact with Greek civilization occurred. The occasion was the accession of Tigranes (Dikran) to the throne (95 B.C.). Until then the tide had been moving eastward. Tigranes revered it when he embarked upon his career of expansion. Alexander's conquests and Seleucid rule had blanketed Asia Minor with Hellenic civilization as far as the Euphrates River. Pergamum and Antioch had become centers of Hellenic civilization. Countries to the west of Armenia had, through centuries of domination, become imbued with Greek culture. Even the Parthian kings (belonging to the line of Persian rulers), who had established their authority over formerly Seleucid territory, and who really resisted the advance of Hellenism, pretended to be Hellenophiles. Therefore, when Tigranes showed a preference for things Greek, he was in line with two trends: 1) the prevailing tendency of his time, and 2) national tradition, which had begun with the Armenians and continued through Artaxias and Zariadris (Zareh), former generals of Antiochus the Great, who, having become rulers of Armenia had, undoubtedly, encouraged the development of Greek manners, customs, and ideas in the court and among the nobility. In Tigranes, a balance was achieved between two opposing forces, and

He, Tigranes, like his government, represented a mingling of the East and the West. The Armenian Empire was in essence an Asiatic autocracy. . . .¹⁴

But that great Asiatic sultan was at the same time a lover of Hellenism. . . .¹⁵

When he built Tigranocerta (Dikranagerd), the capital of his kingdom, he brought the best engineers, architects, sculptors, and artists in order to make it not only a strong but a beautiful city. According to Plutarch, "The city was also full of wealth and votive offerings, since every private person and every prince vied with the king in contributing

to its increase and adornment."¹⁶ A very large part of the residents of the city had been brought from many of the cities which had been conquered or destroyed by Tigranes, and many of them were Greeks or Hellenized Asiatics.¹⁷ A large troupe of Greek actors was brought to the city to dedicate the theatre which he had built for the benefit of his court and subjects.¹⁸ There were also learned men at the court, and they may even have taught the sons of the nobility. We know of Amphicrates, the Athenian, a rhetorician, who had been brought to Armenia by Cleopatra, the wife of Tigranes. She was the daughter of Mithridates of Pontus, whose country was among those which had undergone a profound Greek influence. It would appear from this that both king and queen were Hellenophiles. Hence, it was not surprising that their son, Artavasdes (Ardavazt), the future king (54?-30 B.C.), had a Greek education. Plutarch relates that at banquets given by Artavasdes and Hyrodes of Persia

... Many Greek compositions were introduced. For Hyrodes was well acquainted both with the Greek language and literature, and Artavasdes actually composed tragedies, and wrote orations and histories, some of which are preserved.¹⁹

Such statements have led historians to conclude that Tigranes' court became a veritable nest of learning graced by Greek philosophers, scholars, writers, and poets. One of these, Metrodorus of Scepsis, is said to have written a detailed biography of Tigranes which has been lost.²⁰

Unfortunately, built by a conquering monarch who, without having had the opportunity to consolidate his gains, had to fight powerful Rome, this center of Western culture, sustained by an oriental empire, was destined to be short-lived. After ascending the Armenian throne, Tigranes had embarked upon a career of conquest which had extended his influence from Cappadocia to the borders of Egypt and

the shores of the Persian Gulf. This had meant a strong Armenia next door to the Roman Empire, one of whose long tentacles already had Cilicia in its grasp. The inevitable had happened. Rome on the one hand and Armenia and Pontus on the other had become embroiled in a bitter, but seesaw, struggle which, to judge by the utterances of Cicero, caused more than one anxious moment in the Roman Senate. The result was the arrival of Lucullus in Asia Minor. He won a number of brilliant victories over Mithridates and Tigranes, destroyed Tigranocerta, and by so doing, put an end to this flourishing center of Greek civilization. Nevertheless, it remained for Pompey to establish the supremacy of Roman arms and to conclude a treaty with Tigranes which compelled him to return within the natural boundaries of his country. It is interesting to note that neither Rome made an effort to destroy Tigranes nor the latter an effort to form an alliance with the Parthian kings in order to fight off Roman might. René Grousset, in evaluating the history of Armenia from the fall of Urartu to the treaty between Pompey and Tigranes, makes the following observation:

The Armenian fortress, like the Urartian Bastion, will be a besieged place. Without a doubt, it will make the best of the Achaemenian suzerainty which, moreover, we shall see clearly in *Anabasis*,²¹ will respect its autonomy. It will even escape the Macedonian conquest, and it is shortly after, with the help of Hellenic anarchy, that old Armenia will achieve its greatest expansion with King Tigranes, a great unappreciated sovereign, who undoubtedly deserves the admiration of history more than his contemporary, Mithridates Eupator, if one is willing to observe that Mithridates brilliantly 'brought about the death' of his empire while Tigranes assured the survival of his people forever.

The essential work of Tigrane the Great is that, when it was necessary to choose between the East and the West, between Rome and the Parthians, he chose the West by reaching

an agreement with Pompey. A decisive choice, for it will be the choice of the whole Armenian nation after him.²²

Lack of ability on the part of Tigranes's successors, combined with a change in external political circumstances, brought about the destruction of his kingdom and, with it, his dynasty. It seems safe to assume that had Tigranes' empire survived, it would certainly have continued to be a home of western culture in an oriental setting, and it might even have become completely westernized. As it was, the brevity of its existence did not allow Greek culture to seep down to the populace.²³ Greek gods found their way into the Armenian pantheon and sat side by side with Iranian, Assyro-Babylonian, and native deities.²⁴

But the Greek religion did not become popular among the Armenians, and the Greek statues became sacred to the Armenians as the embodiments of the national gods, although the upper class, which accepted love of things Greek as the surest sign of aristocratic splendor, made the Armenian pantheon conform to the Greek.²⁵

The Greek language, which had become the lingua franca in Asia Minor, did not disappear completely from Armenia. On the contrary, frequent references to inscriptions and records in Greek in the royal archives indicate that Armenian kings still used it for official business. Moreover, the existence of records and legal documents in homes, villages, and provinces as late as the time of the Armenian historian Moses of Khoren (Movses Khorenat'si, seventh century), would seem to show that even among the common people, there were some who were conversant with the Greek language long after the fall of the Ardashesian dynasty. The successors of Tigranes continued to use Greek letters on their coins. Alboyajian comes to the following conclusion on this matter:

All these are evidences that the Persian and Greek languages, at least from Tigranes the Great to the end of the Arsacid

[Arshaguni] dynasty or the invention of the Armenian alphabet, were used equally at the court and the chateaux of the nobles, according to the circumstances, and that the two languages, as well as the two nations, were rivals in the field of cultural accomplishments.²⁶

In this picture, Rome cannot be overlooked. Since her appearance on the Asiatic scene, she had become deeply involved in the affairs of the people of Asia Minor. Sometimes her relations were friendly, but more often they were hostile. At the death of Tigranes (54? B.C.), Rome felt freer to take an active hand in Armenian affairs, and for half a century, there followed military expeditions, intrigues, and diplomatic activity aimed at bringing Armenia fully under Roman domination, until a revived Persian empire entered the arena to contest Roman supremacy. Defeated on the battlefield, Rome accepted a compromise (63 A.D.) whereby a Parthian prince became king of Armenia but went to Rome to receive his crown from the hands of Nero (66 A.D.). Thus, while Armenia was ruled by a Persian, it was under the political influence of Rome.

Obviously, this situation was not conducive to stability. Rome and Persia were still great rivals for the control of Asia Minor, and in their struggle, they had to meet in Armenia. The conflicts were many until the two giants decided to partition the country between them (387 A.D.), thereby creating two Armenias separated by the Euphrates. The eastern portion was controlled by Persia and the western by Rome. In order to facilitate administration and to give Armenians a feeling of autonomy, however, both powers appointed a king in their section.

Regardless of the nature of relations, there was constant intercourse between Rome and Armenia. Diplomatic missions followed military missions and vice versa. A treaty often meant a tribute on the part of the defeated in the form of money and soldiers. Many were the Armenian soldiers who fought in Roman ranks on foreign soil, ranging

from Africa to Northern Italy and Asia. These men, after their period of service, returned home thoroughly familiarized with the Latin language and customs. The Latin soldiers often stationed in Armenia to support a king chosen or preferred by Rome also contributed to Latinization. A rather impressive number of Armenian kings and princes spent considerable time in Rome as guests of state, as prisoners of war, or as students. One of the most famous of them, Tiridates III (Drtad, 287-342?), who was responsible for making Christianity the state religion of Armenia at the turn of the fourth century (301), is said to have been raised in Rome and to have performed incredible deeds of valor and strength on the battlefield.²⁷ These sojourns did not fail to affect the men involved, who, upon their return, became champions of Graeco-Roman education. The Armenian merchants, serving as the intermediaries between Rome and Persia, provided additional contacts. It is difficult to say precisely how important the influence of Roman ideas and institutions was in Armenia, but while it undoubtedly did exist,²⁸ the evidence available indicates that it was less important than the Hellenic and Persian.

REFERENCES

1. See "Guide to Transliteration, Pronunciation, and Stress," pp. ix-xi.
2. M. Apeghian, *History of Old Armenian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 451.
3. H. Boghosian, *The Geography of Armenia*, pp. 7-8, 71.
4. Boghosian, *op cit.*, 40, 73; Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. I, pp. 194-196.
5. In 640, they invaded Armenia in force, and by 654, they were complete masters of the land.
6. The Turkish power was felt in two different periods. It was in 1021 that the Seljuk Turks first appeared in Armenia, while their blood relatives, the Osmanlis, did not make their destructive power felt in Asia Minor until the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries. With the defeat of the Persians in 1473, they became masters of western Armenia and gradually extended their control over most of the country.

7. The Tatars, who had driven the Turks from the plains of Central Asia, arrived on the western shores of the Caspian and annihilated all opposition. In 1236, they conquered Greater Armenia and held it in their possession until 1340.

8. What was the state of Armenia, or who inhabited it during the Sumero-Akkadian Period (3000-2000 B. C.) or during the second millennium, no one seems to know, but the majority of scholars seem to agree that it was the Urartians who inhabited it beginning with the ninth century B.C. (or possibly earlier). The following is what Nicolas Adont's has to say concerning the advent of the Armenians and the disappearance of Urartu at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.:

The Armenians, as so many other peoples, prowled in the night of centuries before reaching the penumbra of history. They are a tribe or a small part of the Phrygians, who at first inhabited Thrace, whence they crossed the Bosphorus about the thirteenth century before our era and invaded the Hittite Empire. The Armenians, that is a part of the Phrygians, took over the Hittite heritage and drove on toward the Euphrates. They occupied the region which since then has been called Lesser Armenia. Later, they penetrated into Urartu and inherited that kingdom at the time of the crumbling of Assyria. N. Adont's, *Histoire d'Arménie*, p. 377. He places the date of the fall of Urartu to the Armenians at 585 B.C. *op. cit.*, pp. 291, 310.

9. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, VI, p. 223.

10. Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

11. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, Vol. III, p. 49. It was the widespread use of Persian during this and subsequent periods which caused hundreds of Persian words to find their way into the Armenian language. In fact, it is said that fifth century (A.D.) classical Armenian had more than 1400 words of Persian origin. (S. G. Ghazarian, *A Short History of the Armenian Language*, p. 166.) Consequently, it was thought for some time that Armenian was related to Persian, and this belief led scholars to place Armenian in the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European languages. Now, as a result of H. Hübschmann's researches, it is accepted as an independent language of the Indo-European group. (Cf. especially his article "Über die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der Indogermanischen Sprachen," and *Armenische Grammatik*.)

12. Recent excavations at Armavir have led to the discovery of a Greek inscription dating from the Seleucidan period (312-65 B.C.). A. Alboyajian, *History of the Armenian School*, Vol. 1, p. 2.

13. Such an inscription has been found in Sevan. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

14. Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 399.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 400.

16. Plutarch, "Lucullus," *Lives*, Vol. II, p. 553.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*, p. 567.

19. Plutarch, "Crassus," *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 421.

20. Yeghishê Turian, *History of Armenian Literature*, p. 301; R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, pp. 90-91.

21. The reference is to Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

22. Grousset, "Préface" in Adont's, *op. cit.*, p. VII. See also Grousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92, 99-100.

23. Grousset thinks that, had the empire lasted, Armenia would have run the risk of denationalization through Hellenization. Hence, he feels, the fall of the empire may have guaranteed the survival of Armenia as a nation. Grousset, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

24. By native deities is meant deities native to the Urartians and the Armenians which were still worshipped by the Armenian people. For further information on the subject, see Adont's, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-230.

25. Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 512.

26. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

27. There is no general agreement concerning the date of Drtad's death. It has been variously placed at 330, 337, 342. Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 576. For an account of some of these deeds, see S. Balasanian, *History of the Armenian People*, pp. 132-133.

28. It is known that in one instance Roman architects were brought to rebuild the city of Artaxiata (Ardashad) in 66 A.D. Grousset, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

Obviously, this was not a one-sided affair. Armenians were contributing to Roman greatness by shedding their blood on the battlefield. Besides, if the Armenians were becoming acquainted with the Romans, the opposite was also true. It would be interesting to see what, if any, was the effect of this situation. There is mention of a certain Diran Haygazn, a student of Dionisus, the Thracian, and a very literate man, carried away as prisoner by Lucullus, who became a bookseller in Rome. Among other things, he was asked by Cicero to organize his library, and his good work filled Cicero with such gratitude that, when the latter established a school in his home, he made Diran teacher of grammar. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

CHAPTER II

Importance of the Religious Conflict after the Advent of Christianity

The foregoing, then, was more or less the picture when the force of Christianity made itself felt. The initial missionary activity of the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew produced enough tangible results to attract official attention and to bring about persecution of the adherents of the new religion.¹ The latter were already worshipping in underground shelters and propagating the faith when they were joined by foreign missionaries from the south and west.²

One group came from Syria, whose people were making successful efforts to spread Christianity to Asia Minor and to Greece. Cappadocia became an important Christian center, and in Cappadocia, Edessa, ruled by a branch of the Armenian Arsacids after the first century A.D., became the most important base of missionary operations. Armenian communities in Syria and in Edessa felt the impact of the work of the missionaries very early and even joined the latter in spreading the philosophy of Christ, not only in their homeland, but also in Persia. An important factor in the success of the Syrians was the fact that their language (Aramaic) became a literary language in the second century of our era and spread into the neighboring countries.³ The other group came from Caesarea, a very important Greek center, and it brought into Armenia a Christianity

which was permeated with the philosophical ideas of the graduates of the pagan schools of Caesarea, Athens, and Byzantium. The propagation of their ideas was greatly facilitated by the widespread contact which had for a long time existed between the Greeks and the Armenians.⁴

Once again foreign influences were vying with each other in Armenia, and the prize was the Armenian soul. Here was a new concept of religion, morality, and human relationships—a whole new philosophy of life—which had come to challenge paganism in all its forms, and one of the first battle-grounds was Armenia.⁵ To complicate matters, foreign missionaries with somewhat divergent ideas were attempting to further the cause of Christianity in two different languages. It took three hundred years for Christianity to triumph. Persecutions, martyrdoms on an individual and collective basis, suffering, and sacrifices were the order of the day until Gregory the Illuminator (Krikor Lusavorich), brought up in the Christian atmosphere of Caesarea, prevailed upon Tiridates III, educated in Rome and a bitter foe of Christianity, to declare it the official religion of the nation. Just exactly what made the king change his mind is not certain. Lay historians affirm that his decision was motivated by a desire to erect an insurmountable barrier against absorption by his more powerful pagan neighbor, Persia. Church tradition maintains that it was the recovery from a strange malady through the prayers of Gregory which converted him. Be that as it may, Christianity triumphed in Armenia at the beginning of the fourth century (301).⁶

This was one of the most decisive events in the history of the nation. By accepting Christianity, it turned its back spiritually on Asia and its face to the West. It so distinguished itself from the representatives of Asiatic culture that the danger of assimilation was obviated. It was the realization of this fact that led the fanatically ambitious Persian Shahs of the fifth century to attempt to stamp out Christianity among their subjects. The attempt failed dis-

mally because the people joined hands with the clergy and nobility to fight the invading armies of pagan priests and Persian soldiers. Defeated on the battlefield, they carried on guerrilla warfare for more than thirty years, and eventually not only won freedom of worship but also considerable autonomy in the administration of their country.

Ironically enough, the adoption of Christianity did not improve Armenia's relations with the West. The divisions in the Christian world resulting from actions taken in the various ecumenical councils made Armenia a coveted prize for Byzantium and Rome. Had she been willing to give up her religious independence by allowing her church to be absorbed by one of the two most powerful representatives of Christianity, she would have saved herself much bloodshed and suffering at the hands of invading hosts from Asia and Europe alike. For instance, when the Arabs (seventh to ninth centuries), Turks (eleventh to twentieth centuries) and Tatars (thirteenth to fifteenth centuries) were ravaging Armenia, the Byzantine emperors were often lending only token assistance or no assistance at all. Mutual suspicion of Greeks and Armenians, the Byzantine desire to weaken Armenia militarily to the point of absorbing her into the Empire, and Armenia's refusal to surrender her religious independence by submitting to the authority of the Greek Orthodox Church were the chief causes. Actions by the two nations detrimental to each other's interests were not unknown, nor were punitive military and political acts on the part of the Byzantines. Armenian cooperation with Arabs in peace and war drew retaliation in the form of religious persecution or destructive invasion. Not infrequent were the arrests, tortures, and severe restrictions on religious activity in Cappadocia.

Relations with the Latin Church were not much better. Her missionary activity in Armenia was not conducive to good will with a people who prided themselves upon being the first to replace paganism with Christianity as the state

religion. Military assistance was often promised but conditioned upon religious concessions. When Louis XIV was making requests for the alleviation of the burdens imposed on the Christians in the realm of the Persian Shah, he was talking primarily of the Armenian Catholics and the Jesuit missionaries. As for the treatment of the Armenians by the Mohammedan Turks, it is well-known. Six centuries of subjugation culminated in the blood baths perpetrated by the Red Sultan (Abdul-Hamid) and the Young Turks under the very eyes of a tepid West, whose half-hearted efforts has been neither sufficient nor in time to be effective.⁷ In fact, because of their half-heartedness, they were fatal to the Armenian people.⁸

Thus, Armenia and Christianity joined hands, and in so doing, they determined the course of the nation's political and cultural life for centuries.

Ideas cannot be legislated or decreed into the minds of people. The latter must understand and accept them voluntarily if the results are to be permanent. Attendance at church and manifestation of all the external signs of piety are no guarantees of real Christianity. Hence, while missionary work had won many converts, and while the king and the court were baptized, there were still many people in Armenia who had not been affected by the new religion, and even those who had adhered to it needed further education. There was a remedy, but it carried an inherent danger. In the process of bringing about the triumph of Christianity, it might so alienate the people from their national traditions that the nation might easily be assimilated by its neighbors, the very thing against which Tirdates had tried to guard by accepting the new religion. Leo sums up the situation in the following manner:

It was necessary to educate the people, and for that purpose the Christian clergy of Armenia could find no other means than to entrust that great public work to foreign schools⁹—Greek and Syrian.

The schools were strengthening foreign influences in the country. The Greek influence had the advantage in that it was the official winner, and the higher ecclesiastical and political powers had been subjected to it. It was Christianized Hellenism which was reopening the roads of its former conquest in Armenia.

The Syrian was the worthy opponent of the Greek, possessing greater strength among the Armenians, being closer to the people with its past activity. . . . The principal role belonged to the Syrians, whose language and literature were more widespread among the Armenians.¹⁰

Therefore, he concludes, until the end of the fourth century, Armenian Christianity was more Syrian than Greek.

As a result, while performing a useful service, and probably laying the foundations of Armenian education, the schools established by Gregory the Illuminator and Tigranes had a foreign character and inspiration. The church, itself, was faced with a similar problem. Since the services were in Greek or Syriac, the rank and file of the people did not understand them. This gave rise to a large number of "translators," whose task was to read and to translate the Gospel and to help the faithful to learn the prayers in Armenian.

Many Armenian students went to study at Greek centers, including Athens and Antioch. Others, more attracted by Syrian schools, sought their education in Syrian centers.

The number of Armenians educated in foreign schools or in schools with a foreign inspiration grew steadily during the fourth century, and it was one of these young men, well versed in Greek and Syriac, who was destined to play a decisive role in the history of the Armenian church and literature. He was St. Mesrob (Surp Mesrob) (?-440?), the inventor of the Armenian and Georgian alphabets. He and Catholicos¹¹ Sahag (345?-439?) realized that educating the people in foreign schools under the circumstances which prevailed in Armenian life would not guarantee the per-

petuation of Armenian Christianity. The political situation, combined with the lack of a written language, threatened the very existence of their people. The following is Apeghian's analysis of the problem:

Eastern Armenia had Arsacid kings, but it found itself under the domination of the Persians. In Persia, Syriac was accepted as the official language of Christianity. The kings of kings, in order to undermine the Roman influence, were encouraging the Syriac language and favoring the Syrian clergy in Armenia. They were protecting the Syrian church . . . The Syrian Catholicos of Seleucia, with the support of the kings of kings, had ambitions of becoming the head of all eastern Christendom, and he had already introduced Armenia, Iberia, Georgia, and [Asiatic] Albania into his title. Catholicos Sahag of Armenia could not remain indifferent to all this.

There was also another sad circumstance. The country was divided into two parts according to the official languages used, just as it was divided according to the political regime. In Western Armenia, which had become a part of the Roman Empire, the official language was Greek. Greek was the accepted language in the Armenian church there. In that way the Armenian church was losing its unity and strength . . . It was, therefore, necessary to think also of Western Armenia, where the Greeks were desirous of keeping their influence and of making the Armenian church dependent upon the Bishop of Cappadocia. There, too, in order to weaken the Greek influence, it was necessary to strengthen the Armenian language with Armenian letters and literature by introducing Armenian into the schools and church services.

Finally, as a result of the political division, the Armenian church in the east was cut off from the Greek church, and generally from Greek education, which [i.e., education] it had willingly followed from the beginning. Catholicos Sahag, his father (Catholicos Nerses), and many others had received a Greek education, and the lack of communication was causing concern to the lovers of Hellenism. It was necessary, then, to continue communication with the Greeks by means of translations.¹²

St. Mesrob's dream was realized (404-405?) with the cooperation of the Catholicos and the king, who realizing the futility of political progress at the time, devoted his energies to the achievement of the cultural independence and development of his people.

In our opinion, the alphabet invented by St. Mesrob is the triumph of the four principles which have guided Armenian life, namely: 1) receptivity to cultural currents, 2) synthesis of those currents, 3) stamping them with a distinctly Armenian mark, and 4) preference for the West when a choice has to be made between the East and the West.

St. Mesrob refused to adopt the whole or part of any of the existing alphabets. Instead, using some of those letters as starting points, he reshaped them and gave us thirty-six (now thirty-eight) letters which look quite different from the others. Moreover, he drew from more than one source and adapted the material to the genius of the Armenian language. In the formation and classification of the letters, he gave preference to the Greek over the Semitic (Syriac and Pehlevi¹³). Syriac and Pehlevi belong to that group of alphabets whose letters undergo changes in form when they are written side by side and joined together. The Greek and Armenian alphabets do not. In Syriac and Pehlevi, vowels are not written whereas in Armenian they are. The Greek letters (i.e., the capital letters) face to the right while the Syriac and Pehlevi letters face to the left. Eighteen (or one-half of the original number) of the Armenian letters face to the right, ten face to the left, and eight face neither way. According to the late Professor Ajařian, sixteen of the Armenian letters are derived from the Greek; four more could have been derived from it; a very few from the Iranian dialects; a similarly scanty number from Syriac; and about five by analogy with other Armenian letters. Moreover, the order of those sounds which are common to the Greek, Armenian, and Semitic alphabets follows the

Greek rather than the Semitic. Finally, Armenian follows the Greek left-to-right system of writing rather than the Semitic right-to-left. Considering the fact that of the three foreign languages used in Armenia two stood on one side and Greek stood on the other, and that Syriac and Pehlevi were the official languages of the Christian Church and Persian state, St. Mesrob's choice to throw his lot in with the West assumes even greater significance. This is another manifestation of that almost instinctive tendency in the nation to cast its lot with the West, even though it maintains its intellectual and cultural independence and integrity.

St. Mesrob's success in creating an effective vehicle of expression was noteworthy enough to draw the following eulogy from Antoine Meillet on the occasion of the celebration of the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the translation of the Bible into Armenian:

The system of the Armenian alphabet is a masterpiece. Each of the phonemes of Armenian phonetism is indicated by its own sign, and the system is so well established that it has provided the Armenian people with a definite phonetic expression, an expression which has continued to the present without undergoing any change, without having to make any improvements, for it was perfect from the beginning.¹⁵

There began an era of feverish activity. There were Armenian letters, and they had been invented to meet a religious need. St. Sahag and St. Mesrob set out with youthful optimism and vigor to give their people a literature which would insure the future of Christianity. Before an original literature could be created, however, the available literature had to be assimilated. The first task undertaken by the disciples of these two men under the guidance and with the cooperation of their teaches was the translation of the Bible (completed in 435 (?)) and the works of the early church fathers, written in Greek and Syriac. The liturgy

was also rendered into Armenian at the earliest possible moment. Original works dealing with church history, organization, and services, biographies, national history, and manners and morals of the period completed the literary picture. In the hands of the fifth century writers, classical Armenian achieved such beauty, clarity, precision, and variety of expression that it later merited the unreserved admiration of scholars. Macler calls it:

an instrument of civilization which, from the fifth century to our day, has borne advantageously comparison with any well known classical language and literature.¹⁶

This is very high praise, indeed, especially in view of the fact that the qualities of the language which led to the designations of the fifth century as the Golden Age of Armenian literature did not, and could not, have persisted through the historical and cultural vicissitudes which followed.

The preponderantly religious character of Armenian literature, favored by future circumstances, was to continue until very late, as was also the translation literature which reappeared in full bloom in the nineteenth century with the rendering of European masterpieces into Armenian.

In discussing the latter aspect of Armenian literature, Macler states:

My teacher, Auguste Carrière, often repeated: 'The Armenians are great, if not the greatest, translators in the world.' It is true. And, through these translations, the Armenians, the ancients as well as the moderns, have saved from oblivion and have caused to be known a number of outstanding works which without them would have remained unknown forever.¹⁷

The first quarter of the fifth century marked the waning of the Syrian influence and its replacement by Greek in schools¹⁸ and in literature,¹⁹ both of which remained in the hands of the clergy, and in monasteries. This was the beginning of nearly ten centuries of close intellectual, spiritual,

and political association between the Greeks and Armenians. The Armenians of the Byzantine Empire (i.e., including those who inhabited that portion of Armenia which was under Byzantine rule) constituted the largest single foreign element. In time, many of them rose to prominent positions, and some even became emperors. In fact, for two centuries there was an almost unbroken line of emperors of Armenian extraction.²⁰ Many Armenians spent time in the Greek army, and some achieved high positions.²¹ Others attended Greek schools and universities. Often the Byzantine army occupied even parts of Armenia which were under the rule of some other power. Emperors moved many families from cities outside their borders into Byzantine territory.

Under these circumstances, and given the traditionally westward orientation of the Armenian people, it seems natural that the highly developed Byzantine civilization should continue to exercise an influence which dated back to the time of Alexander the Great. It was the desire to counteract this influence and to assimilate the Armenian people which led to the unsuccessful effort of the Persian Shahs to replace Christianity with Zoroastrianism in the middle of the fifth century.

The political and military position of Armenia during the following centuries made the development of literature devoid of utilitarian considerations a luxury which she could not afford. Divided between powerful neighbors, subjected to the unending depredations of invading armies, caught in a vise between East and West striving for her absorption, Armenia was fighting for its very existence. She realized that her language and her religion were her two most powerful weapons of self-preservation and that her church was the guardian of both. Moreover, often divided internally as to which side to choose in order to serve the country best, she was united by her church. It did not matter whether the Catholicate was located in the Persian, Greek, or some other sector. The people gathered around

their church, were educated by it, and worshipped God in the manner the founders of their religion had taught them. The church was more than the guardian of spiritual values. It was the very heart of the nation, even when it was, itself, weakened by internal divisions.

Thus, it is not surprising that literature was preponderantly religious to the point that even historical and scientific works were tinged with a religious spirit for centuries.²² Nor is it surprising that Armenian writers should seek material and inspiration in Greek religious writers. Acquaintance with their works through direct reading or translation was essential. Until the time when the Byzantine Empire was smashed (1453) and Greek influence destroyed, translations from the Greek remained an important feature of Armenian literature.²³ However, there was one exception. When the struggle between the two peoples was confined to the religious field, translations continued and even increased. Obviously, in order to combat an idea one must first understand it, and Armenian clergymen wished to read and to digest the ideas of their opponents. Hence, there was even increased activity in the field of translation and a corresponding increase of literature dealing with dogma and doctrine. When, on the other hand, political persecution joined hands with religious competition, a reaction took place. Thus, in the seventh century, we find only two translations,²⁴ a few in the eighth, and none at all in the tenth, in spite of the fact that this century is much more productive than the previous ones because of the rise of the Bagratid (Pakraduni) kingdom.²⁵

Close physical and cultural association with the Greeks left its mark not only on literature but also on the language, itself. As early as the last quarter of the fifth century, there arose a school of translators who, having probably studied in such Greek centers as Alexandria and Byzantium, tried to propagate Greek learning among the Armenians, especially in the fields of philosophy, rhetoric, and grammar.

The centuries-old leadership of the Greeks in these fields had given the Greek language a power and suppleness which were lacking in Armenian. The new school of translators tried to remedy the situation by changing the vocabulary and structure of the Armenian language.²⁶ Many words were borrowed from the Greek. Others were formed on the Greek pattern, through the addition of prefixes and the translation of the component parts of the Greek words. Armenian sentence structure was made to conform to Greek sentence structure, so that a verbatim translation could be made by simply substituting Armenian words for the Greek in the same sequence. Some case endings were also changed. During the following centuries, as Hellenism became almost a mania with some writers, as borrowing and creation were carried to excesses, and as the practices spread to original writers as well, the clarity and naturalness of classical Armenian gave way to obscurity and artificiality. Simplicity ceded its place to complications, and an awkward, ponderous, and involved language sometimes replaced the smoothly flowing prose of the fifth century.²⁷ The best writers were able to avoid the excesses of this school and managed to express themselves clearly and naturally, making use of Hellenisms only insofar as they lent suppleness and beauty to their language.

Strictly speaking, the activity of the so-called "Greek School" covered the sixth and seventh centuries, but the movement which they championed did not cease to exercise an influence as long as the Armenians were in contact with the Byzantine Empire. The impact on the Armenian language was profound. Hundreds of Greek words found their way into Armenian,²⁸ and a large proportion of them has survived to this day. Armenian was also enriched by many newly-created words of its own. This new richness made the language a better vehicle for philosophical, scientific, and scholarly expression. Moreover, new procedures for the creation of words learned and adopted from the Greeks

lent greater versatility to the language. On the other hand, many of the grammatical innovations for which they were responsible failed to stand the test of time because they were alien to the spirit of the language.²⁹

For two and a half centuries (640-886), the Arabs were able to contest the supremacy of Byzantium over the land of the Armenians. Shortly after their conversion to Mohammedanism, they engulfed the Near East in their rush toward the Caucasus and the Black Sea. They wrested eastern Armenia from the Persians and settled down to consolidate their conquests. While, curiously, the Arabs did not engage in active religious propaganda and persecution, they favored the apostates in the appointment to high governmental positions and liquidated those who, once having renounced Christianity, attempted to return to it.

Their influence on the Armenian language was appreciable. More than seven hundred words (largely technical) were adopted by the Armenians.³⁰ Although most of them have fallen into disuse, a few have persisted to our own day. It is inconceivable that these people could be for two and a half centuries with the Armenians without affecting their way of life and without being affected by them. As for literature, the flourishing sciences of medicine and astronomy found their echoes in Armenian treatises, although at a later time. Some historians of Armenian literature have attributed the turgid, repetitious style which characterizes works of this period to the Arab influence. Others have rejected the idea.³¹

The last wave of Eastern invaders, represented by Turks, Tatars, Turcomans, and other tribes helped to push the Arabs out of Asia Minor, but they provided no relief, either to the Byzantines or to the Armenians because they, themselves, pursued an aggressive policy of conquest. The Seljuks appeared in Asia Minor in the first half of the eleventh century. They were conquered by Iranian culture before they moved westward, so that when their racial relatives,

the Ottoman Turks, picked up the pieces of the Seljuk Empire, they followed their predecessors. While the Turks were moving West, the Persians were becoming stronger again, and by the seventeenth century, they were ready to challenge their supremacy. To complicate matters further, the Russians began to take an interest in the countries south of the Caucasus.³² Eventually, Armenia was divided among the three powers, and three new terms came into existence—Turkish Armenia, Russian Armenia, and Persian Armenia—each sector undergoing the influence of the ruling power.³³

In Western Armenia (the Turkish sector), once more the most tangible evidence of influence is found in the language. Mingling with the conquerors and using their language outside the home, people acquired the habit of using common Turkish terms even in their Armenian speech.³⁴ In Constantinople, even word order in the sentence is said to have been deeply affected.³⁵ Manners, dress, and probably some phases of social behavior must have been affected, too, but religion remained outside the Turkish influence. The difference was too radical for it to feel the impact of Mohammedanism. It does not seem probable that there was any influence on the literature because the general character of Armenian literature remains the same until the nineteenth century, with one difference. In the fourteenth century, there is a flourishing of non-religious poetry under the influence of some great Persian poets. Moreover, the Turks had had no literature before their invasion, and whatever they produced in imitation of Persian works was so limited and mediocre that it did not invite imitation.

REFERENCES

1. M. Ormanian, *The Armenian Church*, pp. 19-24.
2. A. Zaminian, *History of Old Armenian Literature*, pp. 11-12; Leo, *op. cit.*, pp. 556-562.
3. Zaminian, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.
4. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

5. Armenian paganism had much in common with the religion of the neighboring people, but, as we saw above, it had also its own pantheon and religious practices. See p. 12, above.

6. Some historians have placed the event at 285. Ormanian, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-27.

7. Some of these took place in 1890, 1894, 1895-1896, 1909. The crowning effort of the Turks took place in 1915.

8. See below, Part II, chapters I and III.

9. There were, undoubtedly, foreign missionaries who gave private lessons to Armenians who were eager to learn. There were also schools on Armenian soil, established and controlled by Gregory and financed by the state, in which foreign languages and Christian philosophy were taught by foreigners, i.e., Greeks and Syrians. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-24.

10. Leo, *op. cit.*, pp. 570-571.

11. Catholicos is the title which designates the head of the Armenian Church.

12. Apeghian, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

13. Pehlevi is the name given to the middle Iranian used in Western Persia. It consisted of two sub-dialects—the Parthian and middle Persian. A. Meillet and M. Cohen, *Les Langues du monde*, p. 28.

14. For a detailed discussion of the origin and nature of the Armenian alphabet, see H. Ajarian, *The Armenian Letters*, pp. 165-175, 270-271.

15. A. Meillet, *Célébration du XVe centenaire de la traduction de la Bible* (1938), p. 18, cited by Grousset, *op. cit.*, p. 174. This was not a statement intended to flatter the Armenian national pride. He had made a similar statement in 1936 by saying: "Armenian writing . . . is a masterpiece of phonetic exactness." A. Meillet and M. Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

16. Macler, *Quatre Conférences sur l'Arménie*, p. 233.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 160.

18. According to Alboyajian, the Armenian schools were patterned after the Greek schools of Antioch. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61. For further discussion of the Greek influence on Armenian education, see A. Movsisian, *Outline History of the Armenian School and Pedagogy*, pp. 36-38.

19. Zaminian, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

20. S. Der Nersessian *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire*, p. 20. These men had become Hellenized and had embraced Greek Orthodoxy. Otherwise, the highest office in the land would have been closed to them.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24. For a more detailed discussion of some outstanding men and women of Armenian origin in the Byzantine Empire, see A. Adont's, *Historical Studies*, pp. 297-537.

22. Hagiographies and martyrologies helped to augment the volume of religious literature.

23. It may be interesting to glance at the literature of the sixth century in order to form an idea of the extent to which religion dominated it:

1. Translations

A. Doctrinal works

- B. Philosophical works
- C. Grammar
- D. Narrative poems and prose
- E. Apocryphal books of the Bible
- F. Physiologies

2. Original

- A. Doctrinal works
- B. Discourses and interpretations
- C. Historical writings

Zaminian, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-89.

24. In addition to the types of original works which existed in the sixth century, we find books on rhetoric, poetry, astronomy, geography, and calculus. Zaminian calls the seventh century the century of poets and orators; *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.

25. The Bagratid kingdom, with its capital at Ani, was born in 885, when the Bagratid Prince, taking advantage of the waning power of the Arabs, declared his independence. It served as an example to other princes, who were yearning for independence. Thus, too individualistic to unite in a concerted effort, Armenian princes were fighting individually to throw off the foreign yoke. The ninth, tenth, and part of the eleventh centuries are the centuries of little Armenian kingdoms. They disappear with the cession of the last one to Byzantium in 1064.

26. Ajařian states that, in the fifth century, when the Armenians began to translate historical, descriptive, religious, and moral writings from the Greek, the Armenian language was not only adequate to bring out the fine shades of meaning of the original but in some respects even surpassed it. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 142.

27. Ghazarian, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-203. Zaminian, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-77, 115.

28. According to Ajařian, nine hundred fifteen words in addition to many proper names came into the Armenian language from Greek. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 5-51.

29. Apeghian, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-109; Ghazarian, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-214.

30. Ajařian, *A Complete Grammar of the Armenian Language*, Vols. I-II, p. 375.

31. Y. Turian *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.

32. At the turn of the eighteenth century.

33. The Russians extended their rule into Armenia at three different times: by wars and treaties with Persia in 1796-1797 and 1813; and by war and treaty with Turkey in 1828-1829. DeMorgan, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-287.

34. This common phenomenon is prevalent also in the United States, where young and old generation alike use *bed, table, kitchen, market, hat, peaches*, etc., instead of their Armenian equivalents.

35. H. Ajařian, *A Complete Grammar of the Armenian Language*, Vols. I-II, p. 396.



CHAPTER III

Contact With Western Europe Eleventh to Seventeenth Centuries

It was long before the end of the Byzantine Empire that another new force arose to contest the cultural sway of the Greeks. When Rūpen I laid the foundation of the Cilician Kingdom by declaring his independence of Byzantium (1080), he put the Armenians in a position of direct contact with Western Europe. Hitherto contact had been either non-existent or indirect. When it came, it was quick and extensive, and it took different forms. At first it was military. Seeing the opportunity to put an end to Turkish domination and to strengthen their own position, the Armenian princes scattered throughout the Taurus Mountains and Cappadocia hastened to establish cordial relations with the representatives of Western Christendom by giving them material assistance against Islam.¹ When Latin principalities, dukedoms, and counties were established almost immediately outside the borders of Cilicia, close communication between Armenians and the Latin feudatories received a more lasting character. It was not uncommon, even from the very outset, for Latin feudal lords to marry members of Armenian princely families. Baldwin I and Baldwin II, kings of Jerusalem, had taken Armenian wives while still counts of Edessa. Josselin I (another count of Edessa) and Waleran of Birijik had also married Armenians. Less well-known nobles fol-

lowed the example set by their confreres. South of Edessa and Antioch "the only [aristocratic] eastern element was the Armenian blood in the royal family and the house of Courtenay and, later, the descendants, royal and Ibelin, of the Byzantine Queen, Maria Comnena."² Armenian princes, among them King Leo II, in their turn, married Latin princesses, thereby establishing close family ties among the leaders of the two groups. When we add to this the fact that in many of the Latin centers, such as Antioch, Edessa, and Melitene there were large Armenian communities, we see to what extent Armenians were in touch with the West.

The impact of Western feudalism, of which France was considered the most distinguished representative, left a deep impression on its older Armenian counterpart. Whether it was through admiration, or realization of its greater effectiveness, or in keeping with their traditionally western orientation that Armenian princes adopted many of the terms and usages of western feudalism, it is difficult to say, but the fact remains that there was a transformation in the way of life of the Armenian nobility. The process, begun slowly during the First Crusade, reached its climax under Leo II (Levon) (1186-1219), the first King of Armenian Cilicia. Old feudal ranks received new names. Many offices existent under the Pakradunis were abolished, and new ones were created. The king was now surrounded by barons (baron < baron) and counts (goms < comes). The old title of sbasclar (sbarabed) gave way to that of constable (kundsabl < cunestabl). The marshall (maratjakhd < mareschal < marhschalk), the chancellor (tjansler < chancelier), and the senechal (senesgal < seneschal) came to join the new galaxy.³ With new titles came a new concept of the relationship between king and vassal. The liberty-loving, fiercely independent feudal lords were forced to become much more dependent on the king than had been their predecessors at any time in history. Codified law and etiquette replaced tradition as an entirely new judicial system, closely pat-

turned upon the system found in *Les Assises d'Antioche*⁴ (thirteenth century), began to govern the relationship between ruler and ruled. Upon becoming king, Leo assumed the right to bestow knighthood on his vassals in the best tradition of western chivalry. He even put French on the same footing as Armenian as the language of the court. Latin and French were accepted as worthy sisters of the Armenian language at the royal chancellory. Italian held sway as the language of the merchants.⁵

The events of the period were reflected in works other than social and legal documents. In the twelfth century, Nerses Shnorhali, the poet Catholicos, wrote a lamentation dealing with the destruction of Edessa by the Mohammedans (1144). In mourning the fall of Edessa, Shnorhali also mourns the plight of his once proud and glorious race. He concludes by saying that God will some day awaken the Franks, by whose might the Mohammedan power will be broken and the Armenian church will recover its brilliance.

A century later, Vartan Vartabed wrote a *Universal History*, whose only justification for being called "universal" was, undoubtedly, the fact that, in addition to telling the history of the oriental peoples, it told of the deeds of the Franks.⁶ In discussing Armenian popular literature of the Middle Ages, Macler points out another interesting phase of the literary question in the following lines:

Under, and side by side with, church literature, was born and developed a popular, love, epic, and lyric literature, which the copyists of the Middle Ages neglected to cultivate and to reproduce because they were men of the church.

As a result of the contact of Western Crusaders with the Armeno-Cilicians, and also as a result of the exchange of ideas, these worldly poems, until then hidden in a few corners, suddenly took flight, and the Armenian *ashoughs* [troubadours] can easily withstand comparison with the troubadours who, following their crusading masters, went to the Holy Land, singing their songs of love and cheering the warriors on to combat.⁷

As Francophile as the Armenians were, they were not ready to submerge completely their national identity by replacing everything native with everything western or, more specifically, French. This was one of the most important causes for the downfall of the Cilician kingdom of Armenia. When the Lusignans, a family of the upper French nobility, having succeeded to the Armenian throne, showed unmistakable signs of their desire to Latinize the court completely and to achieve a union with Catholicism, they were either assassinated or denied assistance against the external enemies. Leo VI of Lusignan, defeated by the Egyptians (1375) and carried into captivity, was released through the efforts of the king of Castile, spent his remaining days preaching vainly a new crusade against the Mohammedans, and finally died on French soil (1393).

One of the greatest repercussions of the Crusades was in the religious field. In the final analysis, the religious element had been decisive in arousing the people to embark upon such a gigantic undertaking. The cross was to follow the sword just as it did at the time of the Spanish conquistadores centuries later. Not only was there a whole mass of infidels to be converted but also a large number of people who belonged to churches considered schismatic by the Catholic Church. On the other hand, the Armenians, who had fought barbarians and Christians in order to maintain their identity, were looking for assistance from this religious movement. The ambition of the Armenian barons of Cilicia seemed to be another element which might foster a climate favorable to the union of the two churches. But there was a price. Whether the Armenian clergy and people were willing to pay it was problematical, but there certainly was no doubt in Leo's mind as to what he wanted to do. To him religious matters were secondary to political considerations. He wanted the royal diadem from the German Emperor with the Pope's blessings, which would make him a feudatory of Europe. Therefore, when the Papal Legate proposed

the three conditions laid down by the Pontiff, with the provision that if he did not accept them he would have to pay "very large sums in gold, silver, and jewels,"⁸ he accepted readily. Only, he had not reckoned with his church, which, after a council of dignitaries, rejected the conditions. That did not deter Leo, who was able to get twelve bishops to ratify his promise to the Pope under oath, and he received his crown "by the grace of the Roman Emperor."

Once again there was division in Armenian ranks, this time between pro-Latins and anti-Latins. The kings generally continued to cultivate the friendship of the Catholic Church, not only by giving missionaries every facility to preach among the people, but also by asking for more missionaries from time to time.⁹ The Cilician clergy reflected the attitude of the king to such a degree that they allowed Catholic missionaries to participate in the national synod of 1342.¹⁰ More than one Council convened at Sis (1307-1308, 1345) in order to accept the Pope's stipulations.¹¹ However, the nationalist party was too strong and the clergy of Armenia proper too attached to the traditions for which countless numbers had shed their blood to acquiesce to a decision which was dictated by political expediency.

This struggle was not confined to the state and the supreme authority of the church. It spread among the people of Cilicia and Eastern Armenia by Catholic missionaries. Catholic priests, accompanying the Christian armies, began to work immediately among the native Christians. For instance, the first Latin Patriarch of Antioch was appointed shortly after that city was taken by the Crusaders (1097). The Armenians, who had been working closely with the Latins the moment they reached Cilicia, must have come into contact with the Latin clergy even before then. Given the favorable circumstances, the latter found receptive ears, at least among the princely families. A little more than a century later, they were joined by Dominican and Franciscan missionaries, who, according to written records,

had penetrated into Armenia proper by 1235. As the political situation of Cilicia and Eastern Armenia deteriorated, the idea of salvation through unification with the Catholic Church took a firmer grip on the mind of the people. A group of Armenian clergymen, who had studied with Dominicans, went so far as to form the *Ordo Fratrum Unitorum S. Gregorii Illuminatoris* (1330), which eventually became the Armenian branch of the Dominican order. Members of this brotherhood were known as *Unitores*, as were the Armenian Catholics who lived in the provinces where the brotherhood existed.¹²

The work of the missionaries continued through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with varying degrees of success, depending upon the locality. The school was the indispensable ally of their missions. Bearing the official sanction of Rome, provided with funds, and protected by the ambassadors of European courts, these men turned to the larger and more prosperous communities of Armenia in order to convert the people from Armenian Christianity to Catholicism. In an attempt to give new impetus to the movement, Pope Gregory XIII, shortly after 1584, opened a school for Armenians in Rome, just as he did for Greeks, Jews, Arabs, Hungarians, and Maronites. For some reason, this initial attempt to attract Armenians to a Catholic institution of learning outside Armenia failed to have the desired results.¹³

It was reserved for the seventeenth century to embark upon an extensive program of missionary activity which included the founding of seminaries and the setting up of printing presses as necessary ingredients of Catholic education abroad. It was due to the birth of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, whose specific object was the spreading of Catholicism among pagans and the destruction of "heresies" and "schismatic" churches. Thus, in 1627, Urban VIII founded the Collegium Urbanum with a polyglot press in Rome, part of whose function was to provide

a Catholic education for the youth of those nationalities which did not have a seminary in the Eternal City. This undertaking was more successful than Gregory XIII's for, apparently, a number of Armenian graduates, well-educated and well-indoctrinated, returned to their country to carry on effective missionary work on behalf of the Catholic Church. Finally, in 1650, a seminary was opened exclusively for Armenians.¹⁴ However, educating Armenians under foreign skies could have, at best, only limited effectiveness. It was necessary to have schools on Armenian soil, in the heart of the community whose conversion was being sought, and such a school staffed with well-educated missionaries came into existence in Nakhitjevan in 1630.¹⁵

The missionaries did not confine themselves to the populous centers of Armenia. They went wherever there were large Armenian communities. Thus, scarcely had the Armenians of New Julfa (Persia) had time to bind their wounds after the horrible experiences of the deportation from Armenia to Persia under Shah Abbas (1603) than the Jesuits came to seek new converts (1640-1650).¹⁶ Books came off the presses. Students came to study with men whose education, as well as practical skills, gave them great prestige. Wherever possible, the missionaries tried to receive preferential treatment for Armenian Catholics. Louis XIV threw his weight behind them, and not from purely religious motives. It seems that he gave serious thought to the idea of a new crusade in the East which would wrest from Turkish hands, not only the Holy Land, but also the territories which had at one time been ruled by Latin princes. Therefore, when his agents and French missionaries were encouraging the Armenians to continue to believe that salvation would come through the Franks, they were anticipating the day when such an event would take place, and at the same time, they were preparing the ground for the revolt of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire, which would facilitate the realization of Louis' dream.¹⁷ Several plans were put forth in the

form of books, one of which bore the interesting title of *La Turquie Chrétienne sous la Protection de Louis le Grand, protecteur unique du christianisme en Orient*.¹⁸

Moreover, Armenian merchants still constituted the most important element in the trade between the West and the Near East. Whereas formerly they had been using Marseilles as their western port of entry, now certain English, Dutch, and Turkish policies led them to trade with England and Holland through Dutch commercial centers. At Amsterdam alone, there were some sixty Armenian commercial establishments by 1660.¹⁹ One way to save Marseilles might be to cultivate friendly relations with Armenian merchants.²⁰ Hence, military, political, commercial, and religious considerations were inducing the French government to become interested in the Armenians.

The commercial interests of France become more apparent upon a study of the program of the French school founded in 1669, in Pera, Constantinople, under the jurisdiction of Capuchins. There, young Easterners were to be taught French, while French boys were to learn Turkish, Arabic, and Persian. The curriculum included Greek, Italian, Spanish, and Latin among foreign languages and commercial law, history, geography, natural sciences, medicine, engineering, mathematics, and drawing among the other disciplines.²¹ This education was free to all comers. Later, this school was supplemented by another in France when the *Ecole des douze jeunes Arméniens* came into being at the Collège Louis-le-Grand in Paris, in 1700, where Easterners, and especially Armenians, were to receive a Catholic education. Inasmuch as the school had been born through the appeal of the Jesuits, it was appropriate that they should be put in charge. The school in Paris was, apparently, more successful than the school in Constantinople. In its twenty years' duration, some Armenian boys, ranging in age from five to nineteen, had the opportunity to rub elbows with the French on French soil, to be educated in the French

system, and to become acquainted with French civilization in its birthplace. The effort could not have been altogether wasted from the point of view of both.

It was in the century of Louis XIV that some extraordinary things happened in the Armenian church. The Armenian clergy were more tolerant than ever toward the Catholic missionaries. Not only did they allow young clergymen to study with the latter, but they also allowed these missionaries to preach in Armenian churches, including the Holy See of Echmiadzin and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, even in the face of opposition from the faithful.²² This was due partly to the desire of the leading clergy to take advantage of the superior education of the missionaries and partly to the profound desire to win the favor of Rome through a conciliatory attitude.²³ One of the Catholicoi, after almost fierce opposition, suddenly changed his stand and became a pro-Catholic. This can be understood only if we remember that Armenian religious and secular leaders still strongly cherished the hope of salvation through the West. The promises of a crusade by the Jesuits and agents of Louis XIV constantly rang in their ears, and the Catholicos Hagop IV of Julfa even seems to have headed a mission to the Pope and the western kings, but the mission came to an end when the octogenerian religious leader of the Armenians died in Constantinople (1680). The efforts of the Catholicoi were augmented by those of the Armenian Patriarchs of Constantinople.²⁴

How much success was obtained by all this activity it is difficult to say because Latins and Armenians differ greatly on the number of converts made by the missionaries. The support of France was certainly a great help to the missionaries, while the defection of some Armenian clergymen from their church undoubtedly shook the faith of some of their followers. Besides, the friendly attitude of a few of the very high-ranking clergymen must have communicated itself to their followers. However, it is necessary to

remember that in spite of all its difficulties, the Armenian Church still had the tremendous advantage of being organized nationally and of having the overwhelming majority of the Armenian people behind it. In addition, the fact that most of the Catholic missionaries were foreigners was a disadvantage which was difficult to overcome. Their writings were looked upon with suspicion, as were those of their Armenian confreres, whose Latinophile attitude and hatred of things Armenian had won them the antagonism of their compatriots. In view of these facts, it is understandable that only approximately five per cent of the total Armenian population of the world is Catholic today.

On the other hand, one of the most novelesque episodes in the history of a nation which had run the gamut of extremes was the result of the contact with the West. In 1678, a delegation headed by Catholicos Hagop had set out to seek aid from the Pope and the Western European powers. One of the laymen on the delegation, representing the princes of Karabagh, was Israel Ori. The death of the Catholicos did not deter this twenty-two-year-old youth from continuing his journey to France via Venice. Thinking that the way to win an audience with the king was first to win respect for himself in the military sphere, he devoted twelve of the best years of his life to the service of Louis XIV and even earned the rank of officer. However, that was not sufficient to help him achieve his goal. Therefore, when he was captured by the British in the War of the League of Augsburg and later set free, he decided to seek assistance elsewhere. In Dusseldorf, "degrading" himself by becoming a merchant, he won the recognition of Prince Johann-Wilhelm of the Palatinate, and was able to interest him in the fate of Armenia by promising him the Armenian throne. There was still one condition present—the Armenians must accept Papal supremacy. Armed with letters from Johann-Wilhelm, Ori set out to enlist the aid of Leopold of Austria and of Peter the Great of Russia (1698). The adventures of

the preceding twenty years were dull compared to those of the following thirteen. In those years, we find Ori in an endless series of peregrinations, in spite of severe climatic conditions and poor transportation, from Germany to Austria, to Turkey, to Armenia, to Russia, back to Europe, to Persia, and to Russian soil again. He is even disguised as a merchant, or a Frenchman, as he confers with important foreigners and Turkish men of state in Constantinople. His extreme discretion prevents him from revealing his identity even to his sister and brothers when he spends a few brief moments in his native town. Finally, in 1704, Ori becomes the "Ambassador from Rome" by obtaining a letter from the Pope requesting the Persian Shah to give better treatment to the Armenians. Even more important, from a political point of view, he is Peter the Great's special ambassador to the Shah. With a large retinue and with due pomp, Ori settles in Persia (1707) for a period of three years. Finally, he dies in Astrakhan (August, 1711), still seeking the liberation of his country.

Johann-Wilhelm and Peter were genuinely interested in Armenia (from purely selfish reasons, to be sure, but interested, nevertheless), but the War of the Spanish Succession and Peter's war with Sweden prevented immediate action. When Ori died, attempts were made to continue negotiations with the West, but Johann-Wilhelm became less enthusiastic and the Armenians, themselves, became more and more oriented toward Russia, which seemed to offer the best possibility for assistance because of its proximity to, and political interests in, the area. The thinking, but not the hope, was justified by later events, when Russian armies invaded the Caucasus, but failed to join with the united Georgian-Armenian forces which were ready to strike the blow expected to achieve freedom from Persia. Therefore, the Armenian meliks (princes) decided to act alone. Fighting broke out with the Mohammedan tribes, mostly Turks, which were oppressing the Armenian population. Led by

Tavit' Beg, the Armenians achieved many successes for a few years (1722-1728), until the regular Turkish Army entered the picture. This fact and the death of the leader brought to an end the first organized military action for independence since the fall of the Cilician Kingdom.

While the crusades had established contact between the West and the Asiatic peoples in or near the shores of the Mediterranean, the activity of the missionaries carried the contact to the people of the interior. They came at a time when constant wars had so devastated the land and so weakened and divided the people that education barely survived in monasteries.²⁵ It was antiquated and oriented toward religion. Western progress in thought and science had not penetrated into the East. The clergy, itself, had not kept its own educational level. When missionaries entered into competition with these men, their superior training became apparent immediately. Taught to reason, thoroughly indoctrinated with Catholic ideas and philosophy, and provided with whatever science they needed in order to supplement their religious education, they became formidable competitors of the Armenian clergy. All of them knew several languages, and many of them learned Armenian.²⁶ In fact, because of their studies in Armenian history, language, and religion (although biased), they are credited with having laid the foundations of Armenian studies by foreigners.²⁷ Some Jesuits had also training in medicine. Dazzled by this learning, some Armenian clergymen came to study with them. While some of them were converted in the process, others took their learning back with them in order to impart it to others. Some young men became so fascinated with the new knowledge that they wished to go abroad in quest of more.²⁸

The church became aware of the fact that the only way to achieve equality in competition was to produce well educated young clergymen who could combat the Latins on equal terms. The decadent monastic schools took on new

life. Those which had kept some semblance of normality were stimulated to make greater efforts. The liberal arts acquired new impetus. Educational reform, begun in isolated schools and monasteries, reached the proportions of a slow movement by the end of the sixteenth century and developed at an increasing rate in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries under the further impact of Armenian printing²⁹ The clergy became better educated and as a result more effective competitors.

Armenian printing was stimulated in the same manner. The written page was the ally of the spoken word, and the Catholic Church was making extensive use of it by turning out books off the presses of the missions in Persia and Poland, as well as the polyglot press of Rome. The first book was printed in Venice in 1512, followed by four others in 1513.³⁰ It is thought probable that, while the idea of printing these books originated with an Armenian named Hagop, the books were actually printed on an Italian press.³¹ In 1565, deacon Apkar founded the first Armenian press in Venice, and two years later he transferred it to Constantinople, where he continued his work.³² However, it was not until after the intensification of the efforts of the Propaganda Fide that Armenian printing really flourished. A press was established in New Julfa in 1640 and another in Amsterdam in 1660.³³ Between the Armenian and foreign-operated presses, an appreciable number of Armenian books came into existence in the seventeenth century.³⁴

There was an abundance of literature in the seventeenth century. As was to be expected, translations were numerous. Catholic missionaries alone are said to have translated a number of important books from Latin. Unfortunately, the language suffered at the hands of foreign and native translators. There was an attempt by the Catholic translators to reform Armenian syntax on Latin. Neologisms patterned after Latin words and phrases abounded. A foreign stamp again began to appear on the Armenian language. In other

words, history was repeating itself. Latinization was following Hellenization and making more difficult the task of purifying the language.

REFERENCES

1. This assistance was great enough to be mentioned in the Papal Bull of Gregory XIII in 1584. J. de Morgan, *History of the Armenian People*, pp. 195-196.
2. S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. II, p. 292.
3. De Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 227; Ghazarian, *op. cit.*, p. 323.
4. *Les Assises d'Antioche* was translated into Armenian by Constable Smpad after Leo's death under the title of *Ansizk' Andioik'a*. Two interesting features of this work are its use of the vernacular and the inclusion of many Persian and French words. Zaminian, *op. cit.*, p. 187.
5. H. Pastermajian, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, p. 258.
6. "Frank" was the general term used to designate all the Crusaders no matter what their nationality. For a discussion of Vartan Vartabed, see Zaminian, *op. cit.*, pp. 189-191.
7. Macler, *op. cit.*, p. 180.
8. De Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 222.
9. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 284.
10. *Ibid.*
11. De Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 253.
12. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 289-295; Leo, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 324.
13. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 399, 410.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 410, 415-416.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 411.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 429. The Jesuits had begun to work secretly in Constantinople in 1583. The French ambassadors, under whose protective cloak they were operating, obtained official permission for them from the Turkish government in 1609. In 1626, they were joined by the Capuchins. *Ibid.*, p. 548.
17. Soon after the fall of Constantinople, Popes Nicholas V, Calixtus III, Pius II, and Leo X made serious but unsuccessful efforts to organize crusades against the new overlords of the East. As time went on, the possibility of a new crusade grew more and more remote, but more than one Pope seems to have encouraged the belief in salvation through western intervention. No less than three Catholicos, two of them in person, asked the Pope to do something for the liberation of Armenians from the tyranny of the Mohammedan Turks. Pope Pius V even granted a church and a hospice in Rome and put its direction in the hands of the would-be Armenian king (1583). Leo, *History of Armenian Printing*, pp. 457, 459, 462-463, 471-472; Alboyaian, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

18. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 340-342.
19. Macler, *op. cit.*, p. 250.
20. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 335-337.
21. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 567-568.
22. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 328-330, 350.
23. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 601.
24. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 328-330.
25. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 355.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 601. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, p. 462.
27. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 601.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 525-528, 540, 574-576, 579, 600, 611-612.
29. This means in Armenian letters, not transliterated.
30. Leo, *History of Armenian Printing*, Vol. I, pp. 14-15.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
33. Zaminian, *op. cit.*, p. 222.
34. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 616-617.



The Reawakening

In Armenia, for very good reasons, the "Age of Enlightenment" took a different direction from the one it had taken in Europe, particularly in France. Compared to Turkish oppression and ruthlessness, the French ancien régime was a paragon of liberalism. Moreover, the secularization of literature and preoccupation with scientific and philosophical subjects had given French literature a character which Armenian literature, still written within the confines of monasteries and during a period when the nation's primary concern was physical survival, did not possess. The "enlightenment" which Catholic missionaries brought was not the type of enlightenment which would give impetus to the development of belles lettres and true scientific and philosophical speculation. However, the old spirit of competition between the Catholic missionaries and the Armenian clergy was becoming more and more intense. The educational movement was beginning to bear fruit by giving better-educated churchmen to the nation, who either went to other parts of the land to impart their knowledge to others or, having reached responsible positions, established little nests of learning in order to lift the mental and spiritual standards of their countrymen.¹

The modest literary and educational activity of Patriarchs Kalusd (1703-1704) and Avedik' (1702-1703, 1704-1706) of Constantinople² was followed by the more fruitful

efforts of Patriarchs Golod (1715-1741) and Nalian (1741-1749, 1752-1764). Patriarch Golod's period was especially productive. Old Armenian polemic literature found its way into print as the Patriarchate strained every effort to make the Armenian people conscious of their orthodoxy and to furnish arguments to combat the Catholics.

Under the circumstances, printing became greatly stimulated and, in its turn, furnished new impetus to literary activity. By 1717, there was even an organization to encourage the publication of polemic literature, deriving its income from voluntary contributions. Ninety books came off the press during the twenty-six-year tenure of Golod.³

Echmiadzin assumed real prominence during the second part of the eighteenth century when Catholicos Simeon established a press (1774) and a paper factory through the financial assistance of the Armenian merchants of India. For one hundred years or more the Catholicate had been encouraging the establishment of Armenian printing presses in such European countries as Holland and Italy, but this was the first time that it was attempting to establish one on Armenian soil, within the realm of the Persian Shahs. It was the Catholicos, himself, who wrote one of the first books to come off the Echmiadzin press, a ringing defense of the Armenian Church, not only on religious but also on patriotic grounds. He thus combined the two outstanding traits which characterized krapar (classical) Armenian literature from the seventeenth century on.⁴ Lesser figures made their contribution to this general movement in the form of chronicles or polemic literature.

Armenian merchants from India also took a hand in the reawakening, but their role varied according to their interests and abilities. In his book (*New Notebook*, Madras, 1773), Movses Paghramian exhorted his countrymen in an unliterary but inspired tone to fight for freedom, while his contemporary, Shahanur Sult'anum Shahamirian, outlined in detail a form of government based on law and demo-

cratic principles (*Pitfalls of Glory*, Madras, 1773). It seems logical to assume with Leo that his ideas concerning law and democracy could not have been conceived in a purely Asiatic environment but rather through contact with the ideas of men like Montesquieu and Locke.⁵ T'ovmas Khotjamalian, on the other hand, satisfied his literary ambitions by writing a history of India from the time of Vasco da Gama to the French and English wars, while Kapriel Hamazasbian translated the biography of Marcus Aurelius from Spanish (Venice, 1738). Others, like Yet'vart Rap'ayel and Samuel Murad, encouraged literature and learning through financial assistance. It was through the former's insistence and material assistance that the Mkhit'arists translated and published Rollin's *Histoire romaine* (1816) and *Histoire ancienne* (1829). Murad willed a large sum of money for the establishment of an Armenian school in Europe, which came into existence in the nineteenth century. From the very beginning, Armenian merchants had encouraged the publication of non-religious books. Now they were demanding it and, at the same time, they were providing for secular education.⁶ The Aghapapian school in Astrakhan (1810), the Lazarian school in Moscow (1816), the Martasiragan school in Calcutta (1821) and the Nersisian school in Tiflis (1824) are further evidence of the interest of the merchant class in the intellectual progress of the nation.⁷

The efforts of the Armenian clergy and Armenian merchants in the heart of Asia Minor needed further assistance from a source which should be in close contact with European progress, but which should feel a strong bond between itself and the Armenian people, whose repeated efforts at cultural advancement had assumed a heroic character. That assistance came unexpectedly from the very source which had served to stimulate learning in Armenia, that is, Catholicism. Yet, there was a difference between this Catholicism and the earlier brand which had made its entry among the

Armenians in the thirteenth century. Not only was it native, but its motivating force was different. The primary object of the foreign missionaries had been the conversion of the Armenian people to Catholicism. The object of the founder of the new order was primarily educational, because its founder had grown up in the atmosphere engendered by the educational movement which dated back to the days of Süniat's Anabad. Thereafter, the founding of new monasteries or the establishment of little centers of learning (some of them short-lived) had become a common occurrence for those who were thirsty for knowledge. Therefore, when Mkhit'ar Sepasdat'si, after having been ordained priest, founded his new order in 1701 in Pera, Constantinople, he was following what had become a national tradition.

Mkhit'ar Sepasdat'si (1676-1749) was a man of mystic temperament, dedicated to one great ideal—the founding of a new monastic order. He spent his youth wandering from monastery to monastery in quest of knowledge. His unfortunate experiences with the pedagogical practices of the day, as well as with some unsympathetic (even very hostile) clergymen, served to intensify further his desire to have his own religious order. In time, he came into contact with Armenian and foreign Catholics and embraced Catholicism. Following several unsuccessful attempts to realize his dream in Constantinople and in the provinces, he brought his order into being in 1701. Political and military events eventually led him to Venice and the island of St. Lazarus (1717).⁸ In his rigorously organized and closely supervised monastery, Mkhit'ar prayed, taught, and published. As had been the case at Constantinople, religious books began to come off the presses under the guiding hand of Mkhit'ar, and continued to do so until his death.

In addition to being a zealous religious leader, Mkhit'ar was a patriot. He wished to enlighten his people not only through the light of what he considered to be the true religion but also through acquaintance with the Armenian

language and literature. His unpublished grammar of the Armenian vernacular, finished in 1726, was followed by another which came into being in 1727. However, Mkhit'ar's monumental work was his *Dictionary of the Armenian Language* (i.e., classical Armenian), whose first volume appeared shortly after his death in 1749 and the second in 1769 through the efforts of his disciples.⁹ This was the first serious attempt at an Armenian dictionary. Its predecessors could hardly be compared with it.

Assailed by many Armenian Catholics for his patriotism, condemned by members of the Armenian Church as a traitor, Mkhit'ar was able, nevertheless, to follow steadfastly the path which he had chosen. This shrewd clergyman, who was able to accept complete allegiance to the Pope, to make converts among his countrymen, and to compromise when the situation demanded it, could truthfully say, "I sacrifice neither my nation to my religion nor my religion to my nation."¹⁰ This was a novelty for those who, upon conversion to Catholicism, scorned everything Armenian and for those who came to regard Armenian Catholics as foreigners. Mkhit'ar did not eradicate these feelings, but he established an ideal for his disciples to follow. Except for his dictionary, he did not give anything radically different from his predecessors, but with his unbending will, titanic efforts, and artistic preoccupations, he set the example for those who came after him. He was the initiator of a religious-literary movement on European soil whose aim was the propagation of the truth as he saw it and the development of the national consciousness through reacquaintance with the past. Mkhit'ar was the natural product and synthesis of the forces which had been operative in Armenian life for centuries. He succeeded where his predecessors had failed because he combined foresight with an iron will in a favorable environment.

His followers carried on his religious and linguistic work and expanded their activity to the fields of history, geog-

raphy, and archeology.¹¹ Father Chamchian's *History of the Armenian People* (1784-1786), although marred by a naive acceptance of everything traditional as true, as well as by a very strong Catholic point of view, nevertheless marks a milestone in Armenian historiography, because it attempts to discover the truth through a comparative study of Armenian and foreign historians. In this extensive work, the author establishes many dates accurately for the first time and comes close to the truth with many others. The fervent Catholic joins hands with the impassioned patriot in an effort to awaken the national consciousness by arousing a feeling of pride in the Armenian past just as Khorenat'si had done centuries earlier. In spite of its shortcomings, this history is considered a monumental work by Leo.¹²

With time and broadening interests, the books which came to light through Mkhit'arist hands became more and more diversified. The purely historical opus of Chamchian was followed by the geographical and encyclopaedic works of Injijian (1758-1853),¹³ which in turn were followed by the historical and linguistic studies of Karakashian (1818-1903) and Aydenian (1824-1902).¹⁴

One of the most important endeavors of the Mkhit'arists, especially after 1820, was their revival of the Armenian classics through their publication. In this, they were supplementing the work done by the leaders of the Armenian Church since the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the Mkhit'arist order was just being born. Constantinople had already printed the works of Akat'ankeghos (Agathangelus), P'avsdos Püzant, Yeghishē, Sdep'anos Orpelian,¹⁵ and others. Echmiadzin had joined Constantinople somewhat later. The Mkhit'arists were continuing this tradition by transforming Yeznig, Goryun, Yeghishē, Naregat'si, Khorenat'si, Shnorhali, Tavit' Anhaght', and others from almost inaccessible manuscripts to easily readable volumes (1820-1836).

For the Mkhit'arist monks, acquainted with several lan-

guages, it was a short and logical step from the publication of the Armenian classics to the translation of Greek and Latin masterpieces. It was just as logical to concentrate at first on the historical and didactic, although the *Illiad* and the *Aeneid* were among the earliest to be translated. Later, more literary works joined the ranks. Great modern Italian and English authors were not neglected, either, but the French writers constituted the largest single group of foreign men of letters who now spoke to their readers in classical Armenian.

Among these determined and methodical monks, Tjakh-tjakhian, Pakraduni, and K. Hürmüz distinguished themselves above all others by the quality and quantity of their translations, and Pakraduni's prose came to be the most perfect example of classical Armenian in the nineteenth century. This great activity in the field of translation led to the cultivation of the Armenian classical theatre in the second half of the nineteenth century. Pakraduni, himself, wrote two plays dealing with the Armenian past. Others followed, but the Western Armenian theatre of this period has not left anything of lasting value. Imitation of the great French, English, German, and Greek dramatists was too close, and real inspiration and dramatic talent were lacking.¹⁶

The greatest contribution of the Mkhit'arists lies in the purification of the classical language, in their methodical attack on their problems, and the expansion of the movements which led Armenians to be better acquainted with Europe and with their own past. In the last respect, although their contribution was great, they were only a part of the general movement. While they retarded the development of the vernacular, they gave some important figures to the nation in the literary and educational field. The modern Armenian theatre was born in Mkhit'arist schools and received real impetus from the efforts of Mkhit'arist priests and alumni in its infancy in Constantinople.

REFERENCES

1. The most influential of these monastic "schools" was Süniat's Anabad, founded in 1611-1612 near the town of Dat'ev. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, pp. 435-436.
2. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 938-942.
3. Ibid., pp. 944-947. Ormanian, *History of the Armenian Church*, Vol. II, p. 2929.
4. Apeghian, *op. cit.*, Vol II, p. 440.
5. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, p. 1035.
6. Alboyajian, *op. cit.*, p. 605.
7. Apeghian, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 506-508.
8. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 979-992; M. Janashian, *History of Modern Armenian Literature*, Vol. I, pp. 14-19.
9. He was assisted by some of his students, especially M. Ananian. Janashian, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
10. Mkhit'ar Appa, cited by A. Chobanian, *Profiles*, Vol. I, p. 47.
11. One of the most important efforts in the field of languages was the *New Dictionary of the Armenian Language* (1836-1837), by K. Avedik'ian, H. Sürmelian, and M. Avkerian.
12. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. III, pp. 1011-1019.
13. His *Geography of Old Armenia* appeared in 1822, and the encyclopaedic *History of Old Armenia*, which was full of archeological information, came off the press in 1835.
14. Karakashian was a champion of krapar, while Aydenian was the champion of ashkharhapar or vernacular. The appearance of the latter's *Grammar of ashkharhapar* (1866) marked an important event in the development of the vernacular. Both of these men belong to the Viennese branch of the order, which had separated from the Venetians in 1773.
15. Akat'ankeghos, fourth-century historian of Roman origin. P'avsdos Püzant and Yeghishê, fifth-century historians. Sdep'anos Orpelian, thirteenth-century historian.
16. Yeznig and Goryun, fifth-century historians. Naregat'si, tenth-century religious poet. Khorenat'si, historian of the fifth, seventh, or ninth century. Shnorhali, twelfth-century religious poet and Catholicos. Tavit' Anhaght', philosopher of the fifth, seventh, or ninth century.
17. See below 198-201; Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-324.

P A R T I I

**THE WESTERN ARMENIAN
RENAISSANCE**

The Political, Social, and Economic Condition of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire

In addition to the pattern established by a centuries-long evolution and the basic psychology of the people, there were other factors, imposed by contemporary events and conditions, which helped shape the course of Armenian life in the nineteenth century. These events and conditions were part of the history and life of the Ottoman Empire.

One of the fundamental facts to remember is that the Turks constituted only a minority of the heterogeneous population of their empire. Another is that, having embraced Mohammedanism, they took the logical step of establishing a theocracy, whose existence could be guaranteed only by a most powerful army. Had the other Mohammedans in the realm been sympathetic to the ruling power, the problem of the Turk would have been simplified, but they were as eager to break his hold on them as were the Christians. It may be debatable whether the vaunted religious tolerance of the Turk was in deference to the sentiment expressed by Mohammed in the first part of the Koran or merely a means of carrying out the prophet's other instructions to enslave or to kill the infidels in order to win a place in Paradise. It is not debatable, however, that this "tolerance" enabled the ruling class to exploit the non-Mohammedan subjects mercilessly.¹

The infidels, unworthy of ruling or fighting, were fit to

be only peasants and tradesmen. Yet the Turk found a way of using them in administrative capacities in a manner designed to free him of all religious scruples. Until the seventeenth century, he imposed a blood tax on his Christian subjects. Periodically his agents made the rounds of the rayahs (cattle), selected from among the fittest and most intelligent children of seven to nine years of age, took them away, and raised them as Mohammedans. At the proper time, they were given responsible positions in the civil service and in the standing personal army of the sultan—the formidable Janissaries (Yeni-cheris).²

Indeed it may be said that so long as military ruthlessness and applied despotism were able to keep up this supply of ex-Christian Indo-European helpers for the Sultan's service, the Ottoman government continued relatively efficient. When this supply was cut off, . . . the degeneracy of the whole regime was hastened.³

As the power of the ruler weakened, the provincial and local officials became stronger, and abuses of authority with regard to the subjects became more prevalent. His royal highness, more interested in maintaining his military might and obtaining money for a luxurious and sensual life in his beauty-studded, intrigue-packed harem, was able to overlook these sins as long as he could continue to derive revenue for his needs. The p'ashas (provincial governors), the "dereh begs" ("lords of the valley," who were hereditary feudal lords), and landlords everywhere eventually became almost completely independent of the Sublime Porte (the Ottoman government) and of one another in the administration of justice.⁴

Under this system, justice for the giaurs (infidels) meant something different from justice for the Moslems.⁵ The central government frankly and unequivocally considered the Christians to be inferior to the Moslems. In addition to more and heavier taxes, it imposed serious restrictions on their rights and privileges. In this land, where "Moslem

supremacy was the unalterable law,"⁶ Christian and Jew alike were humiliated by being obliged to distinguish themselves from their oppressors by the clothing they wore and by the rules they observed in the presence of the latter. For instance, by decree of Osman III (1754-1757), his Greek, Armenian, and Jewish subjects were required to wear cloaks made of coarse, colored cloth. In addition to the required black, cylindrical lambskin caps, the Greeks were forced to wear black, the Armenians red, and the Jews blue shoes. Yellow was reserved for the faithful. The *giaur* women were expected to wear dark colored *ferejes* because the light colors were reserved for their Turkish counterparts. Unpainted houses with an austere appearance were another distinguishing feature of the life of the *giaurs*.⁷ Christians were forbidden to carry arms or to ride horses. Upon seeing a Moslem approaching from the opposite direction, they were expected to step aside in order to let him pass. They were even expected to clean the shoes of the master race. To hang bells in church steeples was a crime, to own a store illegal.⁸ If a Moslem chose not to exercise the prerogatives designed to humiliate the Christians, it was out of the goodness of his heart. The same can be said concerning the official enforcement of these laws.

If a Christian rose above his situation, it was through his intelligence or business ability. Having amassed money by default of his rulers, at times he became economically indispensable to them. By the end of the eighteenth century, in a country where offices were bought for an attractive sum, Turkish officials became dependent upon Greek and Armenian money—especially the latter—for the satisfaction of their ambitions through the purchase of a "p'asha-lik'." The Armenian banker or the Greek financier became a wielder of power through the p'asha. To say that they always used their power for the benefit of their countrymen would be to stray from the truth, but to say that the p'ashas had no check on them would also be inaccurate. In the

final analysis, the p'ashas were little despots with the power of life and death over their subjects.⁹ In their courts, as well as in those of Constantinople, justice almost invariably favored the Turk over the Christian. When an exception occurred, it was through the force of money. Thus, justice, already dispensed unfairly and unequally where the Christians were concerned, was also a saleable commodity.

During the reign of Sultan Mahmud, the Reformer (1808-1839), things improved somewhat. This man, who is said to have been born of a French mother, and who had a decided preference for things French, made a serious effort to put modern European clothes on the "sick man of Europe" and to give him a more just and humane administration in an effort to cure his malady or, at least, to prolong his life. Whereas until then the Greeks had been favored among the Christians through the award of important administrative posts, the Armenians began to receive recognition, too, especially during and after the Greek wars of independence (1821-1829).¹⁰ In 1818, two Armenian brothers, Krikor and Sarkis Düzoghlu (Düzian) were appointed superintendents of the Imperial Ottoman Bank.¹¹ It was during Mahmud's reign, too, that a wealthy Armenian became Barudji Bashi or Superintendent of the Gunpowder Factory, and Harut'yun Amira¹² Bezjian, better known as Kazaz Art'in, became a trusted friend who helped him, it is said, out of some very embarrassing financial difficulties.¹³ During his sultanate and that of his son, Abdul-Mejid (1839-1861), other Armenians reached prominent positions, including that of Royal Architect.

Among other things, Mahmud abolished the power of the governors to condemn anyone to death for a trivial cause "unless authorized by a legal sentence, pronounced and signed by the Kadi [judge]; he also prohibited the confiscation of his property, as heretofore was the custom."¹⁴ He destroyed the Janissaries and began the suppression of the dereh begs.¹⁵

At Mahmud's death in 1839, the Armenians still maintained a national organization which had been imposed on them by Mehemmed II in the early days of his conquest. Seeking to facilitate the administration of his realm, he had put the government of the Christians in the hands of the Greek Patriarch, who was "elected" by the Greek clergy but confirmed by the Sultan. The Patriarch, provided with his own court, prison, and police, held the power of life and death over his congregation, but he was personally responsible to the Sultan for his actions. The Armenians were at first under the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch, but eight years after the original arrangement, the Sultan decided to institute a rival patriarchate in order to counterbalance the power of the Greeks. He transferred a large Armenian colony from the interior of the realm to Constantinople and gave it a Patriarch endowed with all the privileges and powers enjoyed by his Greek counterpart (1461). Thenceforth, all Christians professing the diophysitic doctrine remained under the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch and all those professing the monophysitic doctrine under that of the Armenian Patriarch. In practice, the Greek Patriarchate represented all the European Christians and the Armenian all the Orientals, including Catholics, Nestorians, and Protestants until they were reorganized as independent groups. Some groups were, to all practical purposes, autonomous, but they could reach the Sultan only through their recognized head—the Armenian Patriarch. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the subsidiary catholicates of Sis and Aght'amar were considered subordinate to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When the Erevan area passed from the hands of the Persians to those of the Turks, the Catholicate of Echmiadzin, the Holy See of the Armenian Church, also occupied a subordinate position, except in some very fundamental religious functions.¹⁸

The arrangement was not destined to guarantee harmony and good administration to the Armenian people.

Dependent upon the good will of the Sultan for confirmation and continuation in office, the temptation for the Patriarch to curry the ruler's favor was great. The incumbents whose moral fiber was not commensurate with the high responsibilities of the office succumbed to the temptation, but fortunately for the faithful there were others who bore those responsibilities with honor and distinction and to the advantage of their people.¹⁷

The problem of these men was complicated by the political and economic condition of the people and the traditions of the church. According to the latter, laymen participated in the administration of church affairs. Yet this democratic principle did not operate according to the spirit with which the tradition was established, the first reason for it being that the atmosphere of the Ottoman Empire was not conducive to democratic practices. Secondly, the presence of the amiras¹⁸ was an obstacle. The latter were very high government functionaries, opulent businessmen, or bankers with whose money ambitious Turks became p'ashas. Sometimes, they were members of old Armenian princely families. At other times, they were men who had reached their position simply through the power of money. Because of their position, they were very influential in the Armenian community and important factors in the administration of the Patriarchate. They could seat or unseat Patriarchs almost at will. Moreover, it was their money which maintained charitable institutions, churches, and schools. Under these circumstances, it behooved the Patriarch to maintain good relations with them as well as with the Sultan.

At times, even the amiras sought popular support for their views and projects through public meetings. Yet, these meetings were not frequent enough to satisfy those who were discontented with the rule of this powerful group of conservatives. The growing economic and social importance of businessmen, artisans, and an ever-increasing number of

government functionaries was not reflected in a greater voice in the national administration. As for the provinces, they had no part at all in what was taking place in Constantinople.¹⁹ The situation could not continue indefinitely.

The repeated migration of Armenians (forced or voluntary) to the Turkish capital swelled the size of the Armenian community to the point where by the middle of the nineteenth century they outnumbered the city's original inhabitants, the Greeks, by 125,000 to 124,000.²⁰ They had come from the Armenian or Byzantine provinces bringing with them their particular customs and habits. While association with one another had undoubtedly served to promote greater uniformity of manners and speech by eliminating the most striking differences, nevertheless, the fact that krapar still remained as the written language served to retard the development of a common spoken language. Former residents of Garin, Kharpert, Sepastia, and other regions could easily be distinguished by their speech habits. The Constantinople "dialect" had not yet emerged, but it was threatening to emerge in a most undesirable way, for in contact with Turkish the uneducated had begun to graft Turkish word order and Turkish vocabulary onto their language.²¹ The movement was not checked until an effective press and literature came forth through the efforts of an educated elite.

The religious leader of Constantinople had been recognized as the religious and administrative leader of the nation, and since the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries a serious cultural movement had been underway to give the city a place of importance also in the non-political life of the Armenians. The wealthy of the Capital even contributed to charitable and religious causes in the provinces. Nevertheless, the political capital of the empire had not yet become the hub of Armenian cultural life. The provinces still remained independent and isolated units, doing what they could under the guidance of their church

to maintain and to improve their social, moral, and intellectual level. It was only after the Armenian community of Constantinople was able to take advantage of T'anzimat' to throw its doors wide open to progress through large-scale contact with Western Europe that the city became the real center of Armenian political and cultural life.²² Smyrna, too, a seaport with a sizable Armenian community, possessing a printing press since 1759,²³ and in close contact with Europe, played an important role in this development, but it never seriously challenged the leadership of the Capital after the initial stages of the movement.

The religious disputes which had rent the Armenian nation since the advent of Catholicism continued unabated into the first third of the nineteenth century. Finally, a solution was found by taking the Armenian Catholics out of the jurisdiction of the Armenian Patriarchate and by forming a Catholic "millet" (1830), which included also all other Catholics who were subjects of Turkey. No sooner had some semblance of peace been restored than Protestantism appeared on the scene (1831) to create new disputes and new disturbances, and while it was not until 1847 that it was recognized as a "Prot'est'an millet'i" through the efforts of the British ambassador, it had made considerable headway by the time of T'anzimat' through its educational, economic, and charitable undertakings.²⁴

It was at this time, moreover, that the impact of French civilization was genuinely felt in the Ottoman Empire although the latter had been in close contact with the West since the sixteenth century. That contact had been established by Francis I, who, having fallen into the hands of his arch enemy, Charles V of Germany, sought the assistance of Suleiman, the Magnificent (1520-1566), who welcomed the opportunity to extend his domains at the expense of Charles' ally, Hungary. Relations between the two governments grew closer when (1535) Suleiman granted extraordinary extraterritorial rights to the French by the

well-known "Capitulations." As a result, French merchants could, for a very small tax, sail into any Turkish port in order to sell or to buy. The ships of other nationalities had to fly the French flag if they hoped to have access to Turkish waters. The French government received the right to keep resident consuls with complete jurisdiction over their nationals. Not only was France recognized as the protector of all Catholics in Turkey but also of all Europeans until nearly the end of the sixteenth century. Later, when other nations also received similar privileges, France was regarded as the guardian of the subjects of all nations not represented by ambassadors. In addition, the "Favorite daughter of the Church" became the protector of the Holy Places, and her king was recognized by the Sultan as an equal under the designation of "P'adishah" (king of kings), whereas all other sovereigns were only "begs" in his eyes. At first renewed with every new sultan, the "Capitulations" were put on a permanent basis, unchangeable without French consent, in exchange for the assistance given by France in securing more favorable terms for Turkey in the Belgrade treaty (with Russia) in 1740.

The hegemony of the French language and culture in Europe in the eighteenth century, combined with cordial political relations, led the reform-minded Selim III (1789-1807) to put the training of his troops in the hands of the French, and the latter remained in charge of Turkish arms until 1870, when military circumstances in Western Europe necessitated their withdrawal. While French foreign policy did not maintain a consistently pro-Turkish orientation throughout the nineteenth century, France still remained officially the most favored foreign nation for the Turks, and she, herself, adopted a friendly attitude whenever her interests permitted or required it. Thus, having first helped the Greeks to achieve independence from Turkey (1827), she joined the latter against the Greeks (1854-1857) when there seemed to be a danger of the Turkish Empire weakening to

the point of ceasing to constitute an effective deterrent to Russian expansion.²⁵ French interest in Egypt and friendship for Mehemmed Ali P'asha (1808-1849) involved France even more in the military, political, and economic life of the Near East.

With growing commercial activity,²⁶ improved means of communication, and closer political and military association between the East and the West, French ideas and manners began to make their entry into Turkey. This was only a part of the general movement of French ideas and culture eastward over Europe. The liberals of Europe, having absorbed the ideas of the French philosophers, thought they saw the triumph of those ideas with the Revolution of 1789. They looked to France as the source of light and the initiator of the movement of human liberation. This feeling was so strong that:

despite the reign of terror and the decline of revolutionary idealism under the Directory, France remained to the unprivileged classes of Europe the Great Nation which had first vindicated the principles of liberty and equality, and Napoleon, whose victories spread these principles abroad, was the Man of Destiny. . . . To a majority of the continental bourgeoisie, to artisans and peasants, the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* was the charter of a brave new world, the constitution of a universal society.²⁷

Even the Ottoman Empire had been unable to erect sufficient barriers to prevent its subjects from coming into contact with these ideas, for the Greeks, freer than most of the other Christians and able to travel to the West, received them directly from the French. During the Napoleonic era, the monarchs, themselves, could not remain indifferent to the changes which had taken place in French political and civil life. In distant Russia, Czar Alexander was "playing at domestic reform on the French model"²⁸ with the help of a liberal minister until he decided to abandon it in 1812 in

order to prepare more effectively for the expected struggle with Napoleon.

The events of 1830 also found their echoes throughout the continent. It is true that the roots of the events which shook Europe following 1830 went quite deep, but it is significant that these events came close upon the heels of the July Revolution, and that in Belgium not only did the rebellious mob cry "*Faisons comme les Français*,"²⁹ but also some liberals went so far as to advocate the annexation of Belgium by France. The electoral reform in England, victories of democratic-minded parties in Switzerland, insurrections of liberals in Italy and Spain, uprisings in Saxony, and the insurrection in Warsaw coincided with or followed the Belgian Revolution.³⁰ In addition to the spontaneous demonstrations throughout Europe in the wake of the events of 1848, there was a whole series of revolts in Germany, thereby justifying Metternich's quip that "when France catches cold Europe sneezes."³¹

The enthusiasm for French ideas generated enthusiasm for French life. At the height of the popularity of the French Revolution, the Italians were quick to adopt "French books, dress, manners, schools, and laws,"³² although they were just as quick to discard them after the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815). This setback to the expansion of French hegemony in manners was temporary and only partially effective, for, by 1830, in far away Bucharest and Jassy, the capital cities of Wallachia and Moldavia respectively, "there was already a gaudy, pretentious life with a great imitation of Paris customs and clothes, and with much bad French chattered by the nobility. Bucharest in fact seemed 'an oasis of French civilization set in Slavic or Oriental waste.'" ³³

Partly located on European soil, surrounded by nations—even provinces³⁴—which had succumbed to the French influence, ruling over national minorities among whom the force of French religious and political thought, as well as

manners, was felt through missionaries or through direct contact with France, and itself constantly feeling the impact of the political and military actions of her ally of long standing, Turkey could not resist very long, especially if she wished to avoid the fate which seemed to be awaiting her. Hence, the preoccupation with reforms on the part of Selim III, Mahmud II, and Abdul-Mejid. As a result of these "reforms," men were not the only ones who changed their appearance by adopting certain European modes of dress or grooming. The city of Constantinople also underwent an outer transformation as buildings became more European, streets became wider, and tramways made their appearance, together with trains. "Galata and Pera became decidedly occidentalized suburbs abounding with most of all that for good or for evil 'Western civilization' had to offer."³⁵ It was mostly in the French shops of the Grande Rue of Pera that Abdul-Aziz (1861-1876) squandered huge portions of the public funds in order to give satisfaction to his Circassian wife.³⁶ He, too, dabbled in "reform," but his efforts consisted only of reorganizing his court and palaces on the basis of what he had seen in London and Paris.

Nevertheless, at the time of the accession of Abdul-Mejid (1839), the Turkish prejudice against, or lack of interest in, learning foreign languages had not yet been overcome,³⁷ and the birth and development of a new Turkish literature under the influence of French literature was delayed until the two decades between 1859 and 1879, that is until some men interested in literature had had an opportunity to come into contact with the French language and literature.³⁸

The Turkish press did not come into existence until 1832. This was thirty-seven years after the French Embassy had issued the first number of its *Gazette* and twenty-one years after the publication of its first news bulletin. "The first real newspaper in Turkey was the *Spectateur de l'Orient* started in Smyrna in 1825."³⁹ The *Moniteur Ottoman* also

seems to have preceded "the first official Turkish newspaper," *The Calendar of Events*⁴⁰ (May 14, 1832), as did the Armenian semi-monthly, *Byzantine Observer* (1812-1816).⁴¹ This is unmistakable evidence of what progress and Europeanization meant. Speaking of a later period, when "Europeanization" was more apparent, Gibb affirms that "the new culture . . . is borrowed almost exclusively from France, the other western countries, England, Germany, Italy, etc., having contributed little or nothing."⁴²

This was the state of affairs when T'anzimat' or Ha't'i Sherif of Gül Hanē (1839) was promulgated by Abdul-Mejid and his French-educated adviser, Reshid P'asha. In this, the Turks may have been impelled by a desire to enter the ranks of the more advanced, but it is probable that they were impelled even more by the realization of the importance of a favorable public opinion in France and England if the latter were to extend a helping hand to the tottering Turkish Empire against the ambitious moves of its Russian neighbor. The T'anzimat' declared an end to tax-farming, monopolies, and the inequality which existed between the ruling Moslems and the rayahs. Religious liberty, impartial justice, the life, honor, and property of all subjects were guaranteed. While the framework of the internal administration of the various subject religious groups was kept intact, there was a modification in the powers of the leaders. The T'anzimat' forbade punishment or imprisonment without trial. Secondly, just as in the case of the Sultan's government, the new law provided for fiscal control. We are not sure that everywhere "this decree was a mere farce and remained a dead letter"⁴³ for rapid changes took place in the life of the Armenian community after the promulgation of the T'anzimat', but obviously it was ineffective enough in the provinces to require a reaffirmation and supplementation by the Ha't'i Humayun of 1856. Undoubtedly, Constantinople, which could be watched more closely by the foreign ambassadors and the reforming sultans, found itself

in a much more favorable position than the provinces for the progress of the Capital was far from being matched in the interior of the Empire.⁴⁴ Even this limited freedom was destined to be relatively short lived due to the genocidal policies of Abdul-Hamid and the Young Turks.

REFERENCES

1. M. Varantian, *The Origins of the Armenian Movement*, Vol. I, pp. 1-56. Macler has a summary of Varantian's work in *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 177-275. The above information may be found on pp. 184-186.
2. Kidnapping was another means of maintaining the supply of desirable youngsters. In this manner, Italian and French prisoners joined the ranks of other Christians. It is said that "of 48 grand viziers during the prosperous period of the Ottoman Empire, only 12 were the sons of Moslems." W. S. Davis, *A Short History of the Near East*, p. 238.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 247-249, 279-280; C. J. H. Hayes, *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, pp. 492-493.
5. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 331.
6. A. Hidden, *The Ottoman Dynasty*, p. 126.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 250, 327. For further information on the treatment of Christians, especially Armenians, cf. pp. 126, 168, 278-279, 304-305, 351-352, 366, 407-414, 425-526 and Varantian, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 30-34.
8. H. Oshagan, *Panorama of Western Armenian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 64.
9. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 279-282.
10. Hidden, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-120.
11. The two brothers did not retain their posts very long, for, upon charges invented by a jealous courtier, they were beheaded, their property was sold at auction, and their relatives, with the exception of their immediate family, were exiled. After the jealous Turk lost his own head at the hands of the executioner when his misdeeds against Christians and Moslems were revealed, the third brother was made Director of the Imperial Mint and Lapidary of the Seraglio. For many years thereafter, the Mint was directed by members of the Düzian family. Hidden, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-279.
12. See below, p. 84.
13. Hidden, *op. cit.*, pp. 304-305.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 324.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 307, 324.
16. Ormanian, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81; Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 95-98.

17. Patriarchs Golod (1715-1741), Nalian (1741-1749 and 1752-1764), and P'ok'uzian (1773-1781, 1782-1799) were some of the best.
18. Amira<Arabic *amir* or *emir* = governor of a province, prince.
19. Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 99-102.
20. A. Arp'arian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, p. 9.
21. Arp'arian, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
24. Ormanian, *op. cit.*, p. 92; Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, p. 112.
25. The Crimean War (1853-1856) was another incident in which the Turkish chestnuts were pulled out of the fire by the West—France and England.
26. French foreign trade quadrupled in the eighteenth century. G. Bruun, *Europe and the French Imperium*, p. 92.
27. Bruun, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-135.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
29. E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France contemporaine*, Vol. V, p. 31.
30. *Ibid.*
31. D. M. Ketelbey, *A History of Modern Europe*, p. 176.
32. Bruun, *op. cit.*, p. 205.
33. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 322.
34. Such as Egypt.
35. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 363.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 320,n.
37. For a long time, the Grand Dragoman (High Interpreter) of the Foreign Office was a Christian. Hidden, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119.
38. E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, Vol. V, pp. 4-6.
39. Ahmed Emin Bey, "The Turkish Press" in E. G. Mears, *Modern Turkey*, p. 451.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 451-452.
41. Asadur, *Silhouettes*, p. IX.
42. Gibb, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 7.
43. Hidden, *op. cit.*, p. 330.
44. Davis maintains that these "'reforms' existed only on paper." Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 320; See also Salih Keramett Bey, "The Young Turk Movement" in Mears, *op. cit.*, pp. 478-479.

The Renaissance Generation

As political and commercial events of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought Turkey closer to Western Europe and caused it to come out from behind self-imposed barriers, the need for the study of languages became obvious. A knowledge of foreign languages was necessary in order to shed the heavy cloak of inbred mediocrity and to achieve intellectual, scientific, and social progress on the one hand and to be able to do effective business on the international market on the other. Study abroad might have been a novelty for the Turks, but it was not for the Armenians. The latter had been studying in various parts of Europe since at least the sixteenth century, although at first primarily for religious reasons. By the eighteenth century, we find them studying the liberal arts and professions, especially medicine, in Italian universities.¹ It seems logical to assume that if they went to study in Italy, they would also go to France in view of the relations which existed between Armenia and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even after T'anzimat', when Armenians went in droves to European centers to obtain a high grade education, impossible in all of the Ottoman Empire, only a handful of Turks was leaving the country for that purpose.²

What was a mere trickle before 1839 became a veritable stream of students moving from Constantinople to the West

and back to Constantinople. The sons of the wealthy, who went to acquire a professional or business training in order to be able to maintain the social and economic position of their families, were gradually joined by boys who were not so fortunate economically. Lycées, institutes, and universities in Paris, and to a much lesser extent Montpellier and Nancy, opened their doors to future Armenian doctors, architects, engineers, teachers, government workers, businessmen, journalists, translators, and secretaries.³ These young men, who had grown up in the stifling atmosphere of Constantinople, were thrown into a world teeming with personalities whose fame transcended national boundaries and whose ideas had a magic fascination for them. This was the world of Lamartine, Hugo, Musset, Béranger, Thiers, Guizot, Jules Simon, Victor Cousin, Edgar Quinet, Henri Martin, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, and others. These were the tumultuous days when the lecture halls of the Sorbonne resounded with the fulminations of Michelet and Louis Blanc against the Jesuits. If their public was limited by physical possibilities or by intellectual factors, Eugène Sue's was not, for the *Constitutionnel* offered his explosive *Le Juif errant* in feuilleton form (1842).⁴ This was the period of *Histoire des Girondins* and the campaign of the "banquets radicaux" (both in 1847). It was during this span that the hotly debated electoral reforms were proposed, and *La Réforme* became the "Symbole de toutes les protestations contre le régime."⁵ Finally, this was the period of the events of February and June (1848), followed by the coup d'état of Louis Napoléon.

While history was thus being made, Armenian young men were arriving in the "City of Light" singly or in groups. In 1846 alone, the transfer of the Muradian school of the Mkhitarists from Padua to France added some forty Armenians to the rapidly growing colony.⁶ To set foot in Paris was to set foot in dreamland. The oppressive atmosphere of the Turkish capital was no longer present. The mind was

free to develop in contact with these giants of another world. Men could not sit in the halls of the Sorbonne and the Collège de France to listen spellbound to the eloquent lectures of Michelet, Louis Blanc, Victor Cousin, and others without being affected by them. What they heard was more than lectures. They were messages. They were the means of liberating their countrymen from the darkness which had been imposed on them for more than four centuries. Outside the classrooms, these young students devoured their writings and discussed their ideas, not coolly, but in characteristic Armenian fashion—with warmth, enthusiasm, and excitement. At least one of them, Sdep'an Vosgan, became so affected by what was going on around him that he temporarily forsook his duties as maître d'étude at Sainte-Barbe and student at the Sorbonne to participate in the demonstrations of '48 and '49.⁷

Nor were they satisfied with merely listening to their idols or sharing their ideas and experiences. They wished to know these men personally. Bardizban knew Florival, at that time teacher of Armenian in the Ecole des langues orientales vivantes, to whom he also introduced Ut'üjian.⁸ Vosgan not only became acquainted with the director of Sainte-Barbe but also with Béranger through the former's efforts. Later, when he returned to France, he even became a good friend of Gambetta.⁹ In 1880, when K. Odian fled to Paris in order to escape from the suspicious Hamid, he cultivated the friendship of such French statesmen as Thiers, Gambetta, Jules Simon, and Jules Ferry.¹⁰ When Chobanian, Pashalian, and Gamsaragan spent brief sojourns in Paris, they made it their business not only to become acquainted with their idols but also to write about them.

There was another group which sought its enlightenment within the educational institutions of the Mkhitarists in Venice, Padua, and later Paris. The circumstances under which these boys studied were somewhat different from

those which surrounded the Parisian group. The latter had received their elementary and, for the most part, their secondary education before they went to Paris. They were nearly grownup men fully acquainted with conditions existing in Constantinople in general and in the Armenian community in particular. They were aware of the restrictions imposed by the government on the Christian minorities just as they were aware of the struggle between the amiras and the rest of the population for the control of Armenian affairs. With this background, they were easily dazzled by the broad human principles of freedom, equality, and fraternity, which were in the mouths of orators.¹¹ They wanted to reform things when they returned according to the ideas which they had acquired and the things which they had seen. The Mkhit'arist students, on the other hand, left their homes early for the monastic atmosphere of Venice and Padua. Under the Mkhit'arist fathers, they grew up with an intense feeling of nationalism. The fact that they found themselves in the homeland of Manzoni, Mazzini, and Garibaldi, who had sung and worked for Italian independence, assisted greatly in the inculcation of that strong patriotic sentiment which is such an important element in the Armenian Renaissance.

When these young men returned from Venice and Paris, they were not merely educated men returning to practice their chosen professions in order to earn a living. They were not only doctors, lawyers, architects, and teachers. They were the first wave of that group of workers and writers who were to become the architects of the Armenian Renaissance—Renaissance Generation.

Armenian literature has had its ancient period, its middle period, and its modern period. Within these general areas, it has had its Golden Age (fifth century A.D.) and its Silver Age (twelfth century A.D.). There is general agreement on this terminology and its meaning. The agreement

becomes less general when critics and literary historians speak about the modern period. When H. Torosian speaks about the Armenian Renaissance, he means the period extending from 1700 to 1850. He calls the literature from 1850 to 1950 "Modern Literature,"¹² and he makes no mention of a Renaissance Generation. Instead, he discusses a period of transition.¹³ Father Janashian (Mkhit'arist), on the other hand, designates the first period (1700-1850) as the Renaissance, *krapari* (of classical Armenian), or New Classical period and the second as the *ashkharhapari* (of the vernacular) or popular period.¹⁴ Soon thereafter, however, he mentions the Renaissance Generation, meaning the group of young men and women whose efforts between 1850 and 1885 brought about a transformation in Armenian social, administrative, and cultural life.¹⁵ H. Oshagan speaks about the Mkhit'arist influence, but he does not give the period any particular name. Then he proceeds to discuss the Renaissance Generation and the development of Western Armenian literature from 1843 on.¹⁶

In essence, the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries represent a gradual awakening of the Armenian people through a return to Armenian and Graeco-Roman antiquity and through expanded contact with contemporary civilization. The period is long; the process is slow; and sometimes the direction it takes (the cultivation of classical Armenian) is contrary to that of the movement which will follow. It is not until after the T'anzimat', when large scale direct contact with the West takes place, that the new movement bursts out in all its exuberance, enthusiasm, and vigor. It is this movement, more akin to the Western Renaissance in spirit and vigor, that we call the "Renaissance." We accept Oshagan's beginning date, 1843 (the date of the publication of the Mkhit'arist periodical, *Polyhistory*), and we consider 1915 as its terminal point, for in 1915 the Turk "solved" the "Armenian Question" by the

extermination of the flower of Armenian social, political, religious, and intellectual life together with countless others. Western Armenian literature has had to begin again on foreign soil, under new skies, and in new climates.

The designation "Renaissance Generation," too, presents a problem. This is not a "generation" from a chronological point of view. In the first place, the dates of birth of these men and women range from 1801 to 1860. Badveli Deroyent's was born in 1801, Terzian in 1840, Bedros Turian in 1851, and Mirmrian in 1860. Secondly, their activity spans a period of more than two score years. While the pioneers of the Renaissance Generation were studying in France between 1840 and 1850, Deroyent's was a middle-aged man already enjoying the reputation of a learned person and a fanatic champion of the old religious traditions. Some of his more than one hundred fifty volumes or pamphlets, including a translation of Pascal's *Pensées* (1840), had been published. Father Ghevont Alishan's poems had begun to appear in 1840, but Beshigt'ashlian's poetic career was not to begin until 1849. Turian's brief appearance was delayed until 1868-1871. Srpuhi Düsap's novels did not come off the press until after 1880. Some of the writers of this generation even evolved with the times as old literary practices gave way to the new, while others remained faithful to the ideals of their youthful days.¹⁷ Adding to the complexity of the problem is the fact that divisions other than chronological exist within the group. The workers are separated from the men of letters. The left wingers are distinguished from the right wingers. The Major Romantics are separated from the Minor Romantics, who are in turn distinguished from the transition writers, who show both romantic and realist tendencies.¹⁸ Moreover, as we saw above, some of the members of the group went to the Mkhitarist schools of Venice, Padua, or Paris in order to complete their education. Others chose French institutions of learning for that purpose, while

still others did not even leave the country until long after they had made their great contribution to Armenian regeneration.

Yet, beneath this diversity, there are certain factors which justify the designation of these men as the Renaissance Generation. In the education of all, whether they received it at home, in Venice, or in Paris, European, more especially French, culture, ideas, and literary techniques occupied a very important place. Even under Italian skies, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Voltaire, Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Hugo, Musset, and a host of other great names were helping to nourish the receptive minds of education-hungry Armenians. Armenian history, Khorenat'si, Naregat'si, and Shnorhali were other bonds which united them.

Just as important was their purpose. The motive power behind their activity was the consuming desire to help their people to wake up and to recapture some of the glory which had been theirs. These men were real patriots who dedicated their lives to their people. Doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, actors, and artists were at the same time workers for the national cause. Ārusinian, who was welcome at the homes of the Turkish p'ashas, and who could have earned a very comfortable living as a physician, died poor and exhausted. At times he was so absorbed in translation and in the discussion of national problems that he refused to go to see his patients. This was an unprofessional attitude, to be sure, but he had dedicated his life to the Armenians, whose problems were his problems, whose suffering was his suffering. If Dzerent's neglected his practice in order to write historical novels and to participate wholeheartedly in the feverish activity of his time, he was helping to establish a tradition which was destined to be followed by future generations.¹⁹ Beshigt'ashlian, in spite of his mortal malady, was running from suburb to suburb, writing plays and poetry, organizing theatrical groups, playing parts

in his own creations, and teaching in order to educate his people and to inspire them with the patriotic zeal that was his.²⁰ Sdep'an Vosgan put all the vigor of his impulsive character at the service of his people until his unfortunate disappointment and withdrawal from Armenian life. Krikor Odian, an amira's son, joined forces with the young Rusinian and threw himself into the struggle to reform the national administration, to forge the vernacular into a vehicle of literary expression, and to give a central administration and direction to the schools. Nigoghos Balian, another member of the Armenian aristocracy, not only formed the third member of the Rusinian-Odian-Balian triumvirate, dedicating himself to the cause of national advancement through tireless work, but also became a patron of others who served the same cause. National progress in the full sense of the word depended upon national unity. The divisions brought about by religious differences broke down that unity. For some men, patriotism consisted of a fanatical defense of the Armenian Church, the traditional guardian of the national culture and identity. Anything that tended to weaken it tended also to weaken the nation and should be destroyed. For men like Beshigt'ashlian, the remedy lay in reconciling the Armenian Catholics and Protestants with the mother church. Hence, his song "We are Brothers."

The members of the Renaissance Generation were to a greater or lesser degree partisans of the vernacular, Deroyent's, the arch conservative, wrote a good ashkharhapar. Alishan wrote in krapar and ashkharhapar but gradually leaned more and more toward the latter. Zorayian, Rusinian, Odian, Vosgan, and Misakian were convinced ashkharhapians, as were some of the Romantics. Those who at first clung to classical Armenian were gradually won over to the vernacular as they saw the battle being won by the latter. Ut'ujian's *Masis*, from the day it was born (1852), made common cause with the vernacular and contributed immeasurably to its final triumph.

The liberal wing of this generation rebelled against the power of the amiras and the inefficient national administration. They advocated a much greater popular voice in the affairs of the Patriarchate and the establishment of general principles governing the administration. They also rebelled against the injustices and indignities imposed by the Turk on the Armenian minority in the provinces, but they were not yet ready to take steps in that direction. Their primary concern was reform from within and not from without.

These men had a real standard bearer in Rusinian, who was assisted by his two able co-workers, Balian and Odian. Rusinian's reforming efforts began in the field of language. He put forth his *Orthology* in 1853. He created many new words and expressions patterned after their French equivalents. In 1854, he was making his presence felt in the Educational Council, while shortly thereafter he was editing the National Constitution with Balian and Odian. He was the high priest among the workers²¹ of this generation. He was not liked or followed by everyone, but his wing led the group, and it was to his wing that belonged the future.

As for the event which gave a unity of purpose to these men, we should say that it was contact with Europe in general and France in particular. The political, social, and cultural conditions were ripe for this handful of men to effect a veritable revolution when they returned from France and Italy. What was more logical than to attempt to cure the national ills through the application of remedies they thought they had found in their student days in Paris? Therein lay the strength and the weakness of the movement. The remedies were certainly necessary, as were the contacts with the outside world, but serious problems arose when the attempt was made to adopt the remedies rather than to adapt them.

Who were these men, and what were their backgrounds and achievements? What did they do to merit a place in Armenian cultural history? They were few compared to the

gigantic task which they assumed. They were very few, indeed, compared to the large number of people they wanted to serve. A biographical sketch of everyone would lie beyond the scope of this book. However, a few words about the life of some of the earliest workers will give the reader a better insight into the character of these men and the psychology of the times.

Hovhannes Deroyent's (1801-1888) was the champion of the conservatives and the best informed man on religious matters in the first half of the century. He knew more theology than most clergymen of his time. He had had very little formal education, but he had managed to learn eleven languages in addition to krapar and ahskharhapar. He spoke Italian almost as well as Armenian, and he was skilled enough in French to become interpreter for the Turkish government. His correspondence with French scholars led to his being invited to teach Armenian at the Collège de France, but he declined. His *Armenia* (1846-1852)²² is considered to have been "the first serious newspaper in Constantinople." During the struggle between the "Enlightened" (constitutionalists) and the "Obscurantists" (anti-constitutionalists), Deroyent's was on the side of the latter. What has led to his being included in the Renaissance Generation is the fact that he wrote in the vernacular, he defended the Armenian Church with the utmost patriotism, and he was concerned with the welfare of his people.²³

Khachadur Misak'ian (1805-1891) is a real contemporary of Deroyent's. Dubbed "poet" by an amira, he retained the title until his death. He, too, had a haphazard education, but like his contemporary, he made full use of his capacity to learn. He became teacher of Armenian in one of the more advanced schools, where Deroyent's was director of studies. In Paris in 1848 to look after the two sons of a member of the Armenian aristocracy, he remained there for more than twenty-five years. This self-educated, sensitive, eccentric "poet" wrote chroniques for *Masis* while he

was enjoying the Parisian atmosphere. There, too, he wrote a novel with realist tendencies entitled *Sofia*, which Oshagan calls an aberration except for the clarity and vigor of its language (the vernacular). He was a conservative and, as such, opposed to the Rusinian wing of the Renaissance Generation.²⁴

Servichen (Serovpē Vichenian) (1815-1897) was one of the earliest workers of the Renaissance Generation. His contact with France came very early in life, when he began to study French in elementary school. While he learned Italian and Greek, too, he pursued French to the point of mastery, and in 1834 he left for the French capital to study medicine. He was among the first Armenian students (possibly the first) to enroll at the Medical School of the University of Paris. Two years of further study (1839-1841) in Pisa, Italy was followed by study, internship, and marriage to a French girl in Paris. Back in Constantinople in 1842, Servichen began a very busy life of professional and community service. In a few years, he became the first teacher of legal medicine at the Army Medical School, and he held that post for nearly twenty-five years. He played a leading role in the advancement of the medical profession and the establishment of the Red Crescent, the Turkish counterpart of the Red Cross. His professional work did not prevent him from taking an active part in Armenian affairs. In 1849, he was on the editorial board of *Armenia*. In 1853, he headed the first Educational Council. In 1858, he was a member of the National Assembly. He was a central figure during the critical years of the Armenian National Constitution, working in committees, presiding over national assemblies, and, with Rusinian, Odian, and Balian, giving direction to the life of the nation. It was under the influence of these men and their allies that the national administration was secularized. Although time brought about a slackening of activity on Servichen's part, he never ceased to be interested in the fate of his country or to give his sage advice when it was

requested. Krikor Odian considered Servichen the ablest intellectual during the first years of the Armenian National Constitution.²⁵

Nigoghos Zorayian (1821-1859) received his education in Constantinople and became an interpreter in the city's customs administration at the age of seventeen. Five years later, he was in Manchester, England as secretary in a newly-established Armenian business house. Coming into a comfortable paternal inheritance, he decided to spend some time in the city that had become a Mecca for the Armenians—Paris. Between 1844 and 1848, he became acquainted with some of the personalities who were to play an important role in Armenian life and who were studying in Paris at that time. Among them were Harut'yun Balian, Nahabed Rusinian, Sdep'an Vosgan, Karekin Dadian, and Nigoghos Balian. Upon his return to Constantinople, he became principal of an Armenian school. He promptly introduced his *Life of Jesus* (patterned after a French textbook) into the curriculum only to be forced to withdraw it almost at once because it was in the vernacular and because it dealt with a sacred subject which, it was maintained, could be treated properly only in the Bible. Undaunted by this setback because he was impelled by a strong desire to educate his people, he began to write articles in *Armenia* concerning Armenian education and economics. These were followed by a translation of *Robinson Crusoe* from English and a reader for use in schools prepared according to the best pedagogical practices of the time. Then came his *Love of Reading*, in which he tried to transmit to his countrymen his own love of reading by revealing to them the joys that can be derived from it. He advocated the use of the vernacular as the written language for he maintained that the days of krapar were over. As a result of the enthusiasm aroused by this volume, there came into being an organization of book lovers (lovers of reading) in Constantinople, which subsequently spread to the provinces. A conservative,

without being reactionary, he became the intimate friend of amiras, but he played an active part in Armenian life. Asadur affirms that he was the first to study the various aspects of Armenian life from a sociological point of view.

Nahabed Rusinian (1819-1876) was the most radical and one of most dedicated of his contemporaries. A genuine reformer fired with French ideas, Rusinian was the heart and soul of the new movement. Having received the education available in the Armenian schools of Constantinople, he was sent to Paris through the generosity of three royal architects—Hovhannes Serverian, Garabed Balian, and Boghos Odian (Krikor Odian's father). He was one of the earliest to seek his education in France (1840), and he did not seem to be in a hurry to return. From 1840 to 1851, he studied, he became acquainted with the social, political, and intellectual atmosphere of the French capital, he absorbed ideas, and he married an Alsatian girl. His doctoral dissertation was dedicated to those who had had a major role in his life or education. The last part of that dedication belonged to France. Before returning to Constantinople he had already formed the plans for his *Orthology of the Armenian Language* (1853) and *Almanac* (1854, 1873). They were attempts at reforming the vernacular according to a logical plan and the calendar according to the French Republican calendar of November, 1793. Both of them met insurmountable obstacles. However, the National Constitution, which he edited, triumphed over the opposition. In the remaining twenty-two years of his life, he was one of the most powerful driving forces behind the new movement. He spoke. He worked in committees. He acted as secretary of national assemblies. He was a member of the national administration. He wrote *National Dues* (1865), *By-Laws* (1874), and *Textbook of Philosophy* (1876).²⁶ He translated Hugo's *Ruy Blas* (1873), Aimé-Martin's *L'Education des mères de Famille* (unpublished), and a number of works by French poets.²⁷ He even practiced medicine. (At

the height of his career, he was the personal and family physician of members of the Turkish aristocracy.) Rusinian, the toast of the Balian mansion, the incomparable translator and coiner of new words, the indefatigable worker for the national welfare, died poor and exhausted.

Hovhannes Hisarian (1827-1916) was sent, at an early age, to the Mkhitarist school in Venice, from where he returned in 1844 to take his place beside the other young men of his time. He seems to have become a secretary and private teacher, but he also had literary preoccupations. Hence, his *A Brief Biography of Napoleon the Great* (1848), his contributions to *Armenia* from 1847 on, and his publication of the first Armenian monthly in Constantinople, the *Philologist*²⁸ (1851). The latter was edited according to European principles and practices and written in the vernacular, whose quality Asadur admires. During the year of its existence, it contained many articles dealing with the problems of the day—"National Education," "National Progress," "National Welfare," "National Literature," and "National Statistics"—which elicit praise from the very demanding Oshagan. It also devoted a section to the biographies of distinguished Armenians of the past and present. It published poems, scientific studies, literary criticism, historical and archeological articles, and his novel *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*.²⁹ Before he embarked upon a revival of this periodical in 1858, he assumed the principal editorship of *Journal asiatique*³⁰ of the Turkish capital. 1866 saw the publication of *Ne'rn or the End of the World* in an Armenian which was a blending of the vernacular and classical, whereas in his first novel he had used a clear and precise vernacular. Hisarian did not have the spectacular career that some of his contemporaries did, but he was a patriot very much concerned with the divisions in his people. With his writings, he strove to bring about unity among them and to improve their intellectual level. While he had his moments of retrogression, he was basically an ashkharhapa-

rian. He was familiar with European literatures, especially with French, where he found a large part of his inspiration.⁸¹

Sdep'an Vosgan (1825-1901) had an especially interesting, if stormy, career. Born in Smyrna in 1825, graduated from the Mesrobian School of that city, he went to Paris in 1846. Earning his living as a maître d'étude at Sainte-Barbe, he attended the lectures of Cousin, Jules Simon, Michelet, and Quinet. He met Béranger⁸² as a result of the translation of one of the latter's poems. Having participated in the Revolution of '48 and '49, he was forced to leave Paris temporarily. In Constantinople in 1853 with his degree in arts and sciences, he soon left for Smyrna, where he immediately engaged in a religious dispute. This was followed by a quarrel with the publisher of his translation of Sue's *Le Juif errant* concerning certain aspects of his ashkharhapar. In 1855, he was back in Paris. He founded a semi-monthly, *Orient* (in Armenian), which, among other things, contained translations of French works and articles on French authors. Another dispute with his colleagues, this time about religious matters, and the impulsive Vosgan was traveling again. In Turin, Italy, in 1860-61, he was editing a French newspaper which won him the tutorship of Cavour's children. After serving in this capacity and also as secretary to the great Italian patriot, he returned to Paris upon the death of his friend and patron. It was then that he became Gambetta's friend. Again in Smyrna in 1865, he became principal of the Mesrobian School but resigned, founded *La Réforme* (1867), and edited it for the French community of the city until shortly before his death in 1901. His withdrawal from Armenian life the last thirty-five years of his life was a source of grief to his friends and to the Armenian community. Vosgan has left only little fragments which can be considered literature, but by his education, his love of things French, his devotion to the principles of '89 and '48, his deep concern over national problems, his promotion of the cause of the vernacular, and his missionary zeal he

belongs to the Renaissance Generation. His impatient and violent character caused him to be disillusioned too soon to allow him to make the greatest possible contribution to his nation.

Krikor Odian (1834-1887)³³ has been called the "most characteristic personality of the Renaissance Generation."³⁴ Indeed, he typifies the patriotic spirit which he attributes to Rusinian and N. Balian in the following words:

This sentiment [love of the nation] corresponds to the strongest and most natural feelings. The love and respect that one feels for his father and mother, the charity and compassion that one feels for his blood brothers, and the infinite love and tenderness that one feels for his children are all contained and summed up in the love of the nation.

And the nation was the first word that Balian and Rusinian uttered when they joined the writer of these lines.³⁵

Odian did not have much formal schooling, but he was given a good education because his father, a royal architect, was able to afford the best for him. He began to study French at the age of twelve in an Armenian school which had been founded by his father. When the school closed a few years later, Odian studied with private tutors among whom was Monsieur Gardais, his French tutor, who not only taught him the French language but also inculcated in him a love of French literature and ideas. Years later, in speaking of Gardais, Odian stated that he "would have loved him like a father had God not given him the best of fathers."³⁶ Without having been in France, he became attached to the ideas of the French Revolution and saw the need for reforms at home in administration, education, and language.

When the Odian children grew up a little, their father converted the top floor of his house into a theatre where the children and their friends presented Molière's *L'Avare*, *Le Médecin malgré lui*, *Le Mariage forcé*, and *Monsieur*

de Pourceaugnac in Armenian. However, his conservative neighbors were not ready for such a revolution, and soon he had to put an end to this budding theatre.

Years before Rusinian's *Orthology*, when a mere boy of seventeen, Odian had written *A Proposal for Regulating and Making Ashkharhapar the Popular Language*.³⁷ After probably working with Rusinian on his proposals of linguistic reform, he began to contribute to the periodical *Bee* and many years later to *Masis*. In 1876, he acted as adviser to Midhat Pasha, who prepared a liberal constitution for Turkey. When, upon Hamid's ascension, Midhat Pasha was exiled and killed, Odian escaped to Paris, where he spent the rest of his life. At his death, he left a collection of speeches, funeral orations, chroniques, fragments of diaries, a few poems, letters, and introductions to translations of such works as Rusinian's *Textbook of Philosophy* and Halévy's *L'Abbé Constantin*, the latter rendered into Armenian by his sister. Odian was a true romantic at heart and believed in the principle that literature must ennoble and not degrade. Hence, he worshipped Lamartine and detested Zola. He even translated the former's *Raphaël*, only parts of which have come down to us. The poems of Hugo, Musset, and Lamartine occupied an honored place on his library shelves beside those of Alishan. Pictures of Lamartine and Alishan hanging on his walls were final bits of evidence which mirrored clearly the romantic patriotism of this noble spirit.

To this brief sketch of some of the most important workers of the Renaissance Generation a few words must be added with regard to Mat'evos Mamurian (1830-1901) and Krikor Chilingirian (1839-1926), both of whom were from Smyrna.³⁸ In Paris in 1846, Mamurian stayed long enough to finish the course at the Muradian School and to receive the first prize in his class from none other than Lamartine. This was the beginning of a long career as follower of the Romantic school. His two novels were entitled *English*

Letters and *Armenian Letters* (names reminiscent of *Lettres anglaises* and *Lettres persanes*). He spent some time in Constantinople and later returned to Smyrna to become principal of two schools, to found the semi-monthly *Oriental Press*, to establish a press, and to translate French masterpieces into Armenian.³⁹

Chilingirian was mostly a self-educated man, but he managed to include Turkish, Greek, French, and Italian in that education. Besides his *Trip to Constantinople*, he has left twenty-seven volumes of translations from French literature. In addition to the Armenian rendition of *Les Misérables*, *Manon Lescaut*, *Les Confessions d'un enfant du siècle*, and others, he gave his readers a Turkish version (in Armenian letters) of *Le Dernier Abencérage*.⁴⁰

These men and their colleagues were all concerned with the regeneration of their people. They were all reformers. They had a tremendous impact on their generation and on the one that followed. Almost without exception they were great admirers of France in general and of French political and literary leadership in particular. To Hovhannes Set'ian, France was the "beloved country," "the sublime school," "the promised land," and "the paradise of the Idea."⁴¹

When Rusinian and Chilingirian were addressing Hugo as "Illustrious Master" and "Master" in asking the latter's permission to translate his *Ruy Blas* and *Les Misérables*, they were giving expression to the reverence which they felt and which they had helped to create for French men of letters, especially for Hugo. Arshag Chobanian says:

Hugo was for the Armenian generations which preceded mine and for mine [also] more than a magnificent poet. He was a miraculous being, a being sent by God to lift humanity by the magic of his song toward an ideal of beauty, nobleness, justice, and fraternity.⁴²

It is not surprising, then, that R. Berberian, the Romanticist par excellence, and founder and director of the Berberian

School of Constantinople, should close his school for one day with the following words upon the death of the poet:

At this hour, France is weeping over the death of her great poet. Victor Hugo is no more. This must not be the mourning of only the French but that of all humanity. Hugo was not the great poet of France alone but of the entire world. Thus, the Armenians, too, must take part in this great mourning; and students of the Berberian School, you must be the first to give the example to your compatriots.⁴⁸

The following chapters will show what were the effects of this cult of France.

REFERENCES

1. H. P'asdermajian, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, p. 304.
2. Gibb, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 125.
3. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 125.
4. J. Lucas-Dubreton, *The Restoration and the July Monarchy*, p. 326.
5. Lavissee, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 374-376.
6. The Muradian school was founded in Padua, Italy, in 1834, through a legacy of Samuel Murad. The Rap'aelian School was founded in Venice in 1836 through the legacy of Yetvart Rap'ael. In 1846, the former was transferred to Paris, where it remained until the Franco-Prussian War. Seriously damaged during the hostilities, the school was transferred to Venice, was joined to its sister institution, and was called the Murad-Rap'aelian School. A new Muradian School was opened at Sèvres in 1928. *Polyhistory*, August-December, 1936, p. 186.
7. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 106.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 106, 113.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79. Odian had been Midhat P'asha's adviser when the latter formulated the Turkish liberal constitution of 1876, and as such he was suspect to Hamid and his henchmen. Although he remained in Turkey until 1880, he felt that the danger against his person was becoming greater every day. Therefore, he left the country quickly. Repeated invitations by Hamid to return failed to entice him back. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 334-335.
11. Arp'irian, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-23.
12. H. Torosian, *Histoire de la littérature arménienne*, pp. 382-383.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

15. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 130-134.
16. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I.
17. Alishan always remained a Romantic, but Ajemian evolved from a Romantic to a Realist. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 122, Vol. II, p. 67.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 123, 128, 144.
19. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 192, 203.
20. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 201-212.
21. The initial group of the Renaissance Generation consisted mostly of workers. Whenever they wrote, it was in defense of a cause. Those who had really literary aspirations were few, and even in their case the patriot and the worker often got the upper hand.
22. He published this weekly with Mgrdich Aghat'on, but he was forced to resign his co-editorship in 1849 for being ultra-conservative. Mrmrian, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
23. For a detailed biography of Deroyent's, see H. K. Mrmrian, *The Nineteenth Century and Hovhannes Deroynt's of Brusa*.
24. The sources for this and subsequent biographies in this section are Asadur, *op. cit.*, and Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I unless otherwise indicated.
25. The principal sources of Servichen's biography have been A. Mezburian, *Médecins remétiens et d'origine arménienne* and V. Torkomian, *Doctor Servichen*.
26. This book was originally written in French for his students at the state school of medicine with the subtitle "According to the Best Authors of the Eclectic School" and was translated into Armenian in 1879 by S. Et'mek'jian, with a biographical sketch written by K. Odian. The influence of Cousin is obvious. Rusinian, too, is a follower of "the true, the beautiful, and the good" reminiscent of Cousin's *Du vrai, du beau, et du bien*.
27. At times, when he was busy finishing a translation, preparing a speech, completing a document of reform, or drawing up rules, he neglected his patients. Y. Odian, "Rusinian" in *Masis*, Oct. 10, 1892, p. 246. It is said that once, while he was translating *L'Education des mères de famille*, his frightened wife rushed in to tell him that a fire was raging on their street. "It has not yet reached our house. Leave me alone," was his reply. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 211.
28. *Philologist* = *Panaser*. The Armenian word meant "lover of literature" or "lover of learning."
29. *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* is the first novel in Western Armenian literature.
30. Asadur calls it *Journal de Constantinople*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
31. See below, pp. 210-211.
32. According to Asadur, "It was Vosgan's dream to meet Béranger, whose songs his friends sang every day." "Our Life," *Masis*, Aug. 1, 1892, p. 162.
33. In addition to Asadur and Oshagan, Y. Odian "Intimate Life of Odian," *Masis*, April 3, 1893, pp. 195-198, has been used as a source for Krikor Odian's biography.

34. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 333.

35. K. Odian, *op. cit.*, pp. VIII-IX.

36. *Ibid.*, p. XXI.

37. It was first published in Hisarian's *Philologist* in 1851.

38. Other members of the Renaissance Generation, workers, as well as writers, were Fr. Alishan, Beshigt'ashlian, Baronian, B. Tusian, Ut'ujian, Terzian, Shishmanian (Dzerent's), Hek'imian, N. and H. Balian, K. Dadian, Bardizban, Aghapegian, Servichen, Narbey, Set'ian, G. Karakash, Cheraz, Ajemian, Berberian, Ayvazovski, and a host of others.

39. See Appendix for some of Mamurian's translations.

40. See Appendix for some of Chilingirian's translations.

41. H. Set'ian "A la France," Chobanian, *Victor Hugo, Chateaubriand et Lamartine dans la littérature arménienne*, p. 23.

42. A. Chobanian, *Victor Hugo, Chateaubriand et Lamartine dans la littérature arménienne*, p. 72.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

The Armenian National Constitution and the Armenian Movement

The repercussions of T'anzimat' were felt quickly. The new law forbade punishment without trial, which meant that henceforth the Patriarch's power over the faithful was limited. His fiscal powers, too, were reduced. Officers of the realm could formerly demand whatever money they wished and spent it without any check save their conscience. Now they found themselves limited by financial controls. The minority groups had to submit to the same fiscal regulations. As early as 1840, a judicial council and an economic council (for the collection of taxes) were formed within the Patriarchate.¹

It was precisely the problem of the composition of these councils which stirred up trouble for the Patriarchate and the amiras. Between 1840 and 1844, councils consisting of men outside the realm of amiras met insurmountable difficulties. On the other hand, the revival of the old council of ten amiras met the dual difficulty of unpopularity among the people and internal dissension among the amiras, themselves. Finally, with the support of Patriarch Mat'evos, a compromise was effected through the formation of a mixed council consisting of sixteen amiras and fourteen popular representatives.²

By 1847, the expansion of western ideas was assisting internal need and agitation in winning the amiras over to

the popular cause. Young amiras just back from European, especially French, institutions of higher learning, imbued with western ideas of equality, representative government, and universal suffrage, fought for unrestricted election by popular vote and used their influence to have it accepted by the Turkish government. Thereupon, a Religious Council of fourteen members and a Civil (Supreme) Council of twenty members (consisting of ten amiras and ten tradesmen and merchants) were elected.³ The former's jurisdiction extended to all religious matters and the latter's to all non-religious matters. The arrangement of 1847, approved by the Turkish government, marked the triumph of the people over the amiras and the separation of religious and temporal matters. Although, strictly speaking, it was not really democratic in that it excluded the provinces from a voice in the administration of their affairs, it was a great step forward, for elections were based on universal male suffrage in Constantinople.

The new arrangement took the authority out of the hands of a few powerful men and put it in those of duly elected representatives. It followed in fact, as well as in spirit, the democratic ideal of the Armenian church which has traditionally given a voice to laymen in matters pertaining to the church, for the church and the nation have been almost synonymous from the very beginning of Christianity. The liberals or the Enlightened (Lusavoryalner) had won the day against the reactionaries or Obscurantists (Khavaryalner).

It was too much to expect the new national administration to function perfectly. The amiras still wielded great power in the Civil Council because of their historical role and because of their position in the Turkish government. There were some conflicts as Patriarch Mat'evos, at odds with the amiras, resigned in 1848, and the people staged a demonstration in his behalf.⁴ Rules were needed to define and to delimit the responsibilities of the two councils and

to clarify the rights and privileges of voters. Furthermore, the reforms promised by the government in article IX of the Treaty of Paris (1856) were based upon the condition that each group within the empire would submit a set of "rights . . . privileges . . . specified and formulated by an organic law" to be approved by the Sublime Porte.⁵ A final factor which must have contributed to the eventual editing of a carefully planned set of rules was the fact that the Eastern Armenians had already drawn up such a document—the Polojenié—in 1836. The days of the Armenian National Constitution were fast approaching.

In 1856, when the Treaty of Paris was signed, Rusinian had already been back in Constantinople for six years. N. Balian had been back longer. They had had an opportunity to become thoroughly reacquainted with the events at home and to become deeply involved in them. In discussing the work of his two friends and the needs of the period, Krikor Odian states:

In those days, the Nation had something like an administration, something like a language, and something like schools. They [Rusinian and Balian] undertook to give form to these three things which are the three things essential to national progress. From this undertaking was born the Constitution, *Orthology*, and the *Educational Council*.⁶

It is said that Balian had already conceived the basic principles of the Constitution by 1850, but a decade was to elapse before they took tangible form. Repeatedly, the three friends and allies found themselves working in or with committees whose task it was to draw up a set of laws to govern the nation. The labors and frustrations of 1857 and 1859 culminated in the Armenian National Constitution of 1860. Unfortunately, three more turbulent years were to elapse, and the Constitution had to undergo changes before the Sublime Porte was willing to ratify it and the Armenians ready to unite behind it.⁷

The constitution that these men put forth was the embodiment of the liberal ideas which had emanated from France. In its preamble, entitled "Fundamental Principles," it states:

Every individual in the Nation has duties toward the Nation. The Nation, on its part, has duties toward each and every individual. Likewise, every individual has the right to expect certain things from the Nation, and the Nation from the individual.

Therefore, the Nation and individuals are bound together through mutual responsibilities so that the duties of one are the rights of the other.²⁸

It is interesting to note the emphasis of the opening sentence of this preamble. It is not a one-sided statement of the rights of the individual as the Declaration of the Rights of Man had been.⁹ The position of the individual Armenian vis-à-vis the amiras and the Patriarch, while bearing certain resemblances to that of the individual Frenchman vis-à-vis his government, was fundamentally different. A declaration similar to the French document would have been more appropriate against the Turkish government. It was necessary for the formulators to assert rights and secure privileges without destroying the central power, which, in the final analysis, made possible the existence of the Armenian community as such within the framework of the Turkish Empire. The central authority and the individuals comprising the community had to cooperate wholeheartedly in order not only to maintain their identity but also to derive maximum benefits from their efforts. If the individual had rights, so had the nation. If the individual had duties, so had the nation. The preamble was the concise expression of the principles which insure the existence of democratic institutions, responsible citizenship, and mutual responsibility between the individual and the ruling authority. The men who had drawn up this document were familiar with the history of French political ideas, but they were also

deeply aware of some of the problems and the dangers which beset their nation.

Part II. of "Fundamental Principles" states:

It is the duty of the members of the Nation to share in the expenses required by the Nation, each according to his ability, to render willingly the services asked by the Nation, and to obey gladly the regulations laid down by it.

This duty of the members of the Nation is its right.¹⁰

Even before Robespierre's Declaration of the Rights of Man, the Constitution of 1791 had declared the principle of proportional taxation.¹¹ More than one constitutional document thereafter reiterated that principle.¹² As for the provisions of the document of 1793, they state that "the rest of the citizens are bound to contribute to the public expenses according to their fortune."¹³

Part III, continuing the enumeration of mutual duties, stipulates that:

It is the duty of the Nation to attend to the moral, intellectual and material needs of its members—to extend equally to boys and girls of all classes the education necessary to human beings—to take paternal care of the needy—finally to work devotedly for national progress.

This duty of the Nation is the right of its members.¹⁴

Articles X and XIII of the Declaration of the Rights of Man said essentially the same thing when they affirmed that:

Society is obliged to provide for the subsistence of all its members, either by giving them work or by supporting those who are unable to work.

and that:

Society is bound to forward, to the best of its ability, the progress of the popular understanding, and to place education within the reach of all its citizens.¹⁵

Finally, the "Fundamental Principles" concludes with this statement:

The basis of Representative Administration is the principle of *RIGHTS* and *DUTIES*, which is the principle of *justice*. Its strength lies in the multiplicity of voices, which is the principle of *legality*.¹⁶

The essence of this assertion is the same as Robespierre's Declaration which says:

Liberty is the power belonging to man, to exercise all his faculties as he chooses; its rule is *justice*, its limits the *rights* of others, nature its principle, and the *law* its safeguard.¹⁷

The ninety-nine articles of the Constitution are divided into five sections entitled "Chapters" in the manner of the French Constitution of 1848.¹⁸ The first chapter, consisting of eighty-four articles, deals with the "Central Administration." Articles one through seven deal with the election and resignation of the chief executive—the Patriarch. Eight through twelve describe the office of the Patriarch and define its duties, while thirteen through sixteen provide for a well-organized patriarchate. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem is the subject of articles seventeen through twenty-three, followed by the Religious Council (articles twenty-four to thirty-five), and the Civil Council (articles thirty-six to forty-three). Seven subsidiary bodies are elected by the Civil Council: (1) the Educational Council (article forty-five), (2) the Economic Council (article forty-six), (3) the Judicial Council (article forty-seven), (4) Monastic Council (article forty-eight), (5) Treasury Committee (article forty-nine), (6) Committee on wills (article fifty), and (7) Trustees of the National Hospital (article fifty-one). After treating the parish councils in articles fifty-two to fifty-six, the Constitution goes on to discuss all matters pertaining to the organization and functioning of the National Assembly (articles fifty-seven to eighty-

four). Chapter II prescribes rules for the operation of the subsidiary bodies and committees. Chapter III takes up the matter of dues. Chapter IV deals with provincial administration, while the last chapter provides for amending the Constitution.

It is important to point out a few general features of this document. It is a carefully considered and a logically constructed piece of work. Its language is a clear and simple ashkharhapar. In it triumphs the principle of responsibility on the part of officials. The patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem are expected to make certain that the provisions of the National Constitution and the rules operating in the Armenian monastery of Jerusalem are carried out. They are empowered to remove officials and clergymen who fail to carry out those rules and provisions. They, themselves, must obey the regulations, and if they fail to do so, they are subject to impeachment. It establishes a representative system of administration based on direct and indirect elections, beginning with the Patriarch of Constantinople and including the tiniest provincial parish. This is a remarkable innovation for the Ottoman Empire. The principles of the superiority of the law and executive responsibility are present in various degrees in every French constitution from 1791 to 1848,¹⁹ although they are more limited in some than in others.²⁰ The unicameral legislative body also constitutes a bond between this document and the liberal constitutions of 1791, 1793, and 1848, while the Secular (Supreme) Council would seem to correspond to the Council of State of the Constitution of 1848.

The principle of universal suffrage proclaimed by the constitution of 1848²¹ is not fully reflected in the Armenian National Constitution, which extends voting privileges to all (male) Armenians of twenty-five years of age or over who are subjects of the Ottoman Empire, who have paid their dues, or who possess personal merit, i.e., they hold important governmental positions, they are doctors, teach-

ers, authors of "useful books," or they "have rendered useful service to the nation."²² The age limit and the payment of dues (or taxes) follow the provisions of the constitution of 1791 or the electoral law of 1830,²³ while the other provisions seem to represent an attempt to recognize and utilize the material and intellectual benefactors of the nation. The final statement of article sixty-eight is an obvious concession to the amiras, for it states:

But of the eighty representatives elected by the various quarters of Constantinople at least seven must be persons of rank.²⁴

The administration established by the Constitution contained religious and secular elements, but it was the secular element which played by far the more important role. It is true that the Patriarch was still the head of the nation for historical and practical reasons. The Armenian nation was still considered a religious community at the time of the formulation of the Constitution, even though it was called *Ermeni millet'i* (Armenian Nation).²⁵ Thus, it was necessary to have a religious leader at the head of the nation, but that leader was an elected official subject to the will of the people as represented by the Constitution. The Religious Council, while it was independent of the Secular Council, was elected by a representative assembly only twenty of whose members were clergymen, and its jurisdiction extended to purely religious matters.²⁶ The Civil Council's carefully outlined authority extended to all civil functions. It elected the seven councils or committees which administered the life of the community two of which—the Educational Council and the Economic Council—consisted wholly of laymen.²⁷ In other words, educational and economic administrations were completely secularized in keeping with the trend of the times. The great debates which had taken place in France in the forties had not been lost on the framers of the Constitution. In the Judicial Council, there

were four clergymen and four laymen. This is understandable since one of the most important tasks of this council was to judge family disputes.²⁸ The Constitution merely prescribed seven members to the Monastic Council and Treasury Committee without specifying whether they should be clerics or laymen.²⁹ The Committee on Wills was to be composed of three clergymen and four laymen.³⁰ Finally, the Board of Trustees of the National Hospital was to have nine members. Again, specification was not made.³¹

Once again, perhaps motivated by practical considerations such as distances to be traveled, imperfect and inefficient means of transportation, and finances, or simply because the impact of democratic ideas had not been fully felt, Constantinople played a role far in excess of that justified by its relative population. Of the one hundred forty members of the National Assembly, twenty clergymen and eighty laymen were to come from the Capital. Nevertheless, this was a great improvement. Moreover, this document was a more democratic instrument than the constitution of the Greek community which gave the dominant role to the clergy.³²

The Armenian National Constitution was to a large extent the triumph of the ideas of '89 and '48, but was it the best possible instrument of government for the Armenians? It is difficult to say. However, from the outset, it was bound to meet two obstacles, namely: (1) Armenian individualism and (2) conditions and attitudes resulting from centuries of living in an autocratic state. Outside of the intellectuals who had come into direct contact with French political institutions, the people were not familiar with such an elaborate administrative machinery which prescribed duties and obligations to every council and committee, which gave various bodies a certain independence while at the same time it made them dependent upon one another, and eventually on the will of the people. The formulators had been guided by logic and the example of the French

but not to any great extent by national experience. Logic cannot replace practical experience in the ways of democracy, and yet logic was Rusinian's supreme guide. Odian, in analyzing his friend's character, has the following to say about him:

Rusinian read little but thought much. He had general principles, to which he was attached the way one is attached to his faith. His mind was capable of understanding only the absolute. He looked at each problem by itself without considering the relations it might have with related problems—Rusinian could not understand that it is not possible to shape everything according to the dictates of reason or to simplify what is complex.³³

This devotion to reason owed itself, undoubtedly, not only to innate tendencies but also to his French education. He must have also felt that a period of trial and error had inevitably to follow and that violent disputes were a necessary ingredient of the situation, for had he not witnessed such things in the capital of the country which he so admired?

From the very outset, the Constitution was beset by difficulties. Accepted by the Armenian community in 1860, it gave rise to such violent disputes that Dr. Servichen, in an attempt to calm the passions, used his influence with the Turkish government to have it temporarily suspended even before it was approved.³⁴ Others had to use their influence to end the suspension and to receive approval, which finally came in 1863. Even then it was far from functioning smoothly. In fact ten years later Patriarch Khrimian was complaining that:

Our National Constitution was edited in the capital [Constantinople] and by those persons who know Europe better than the geography of Armenia—and thus our National Constitution has been fashioned according to European rather than Armenian ideas.³⁵

It was at that time that people felt the need for a set of by-laws as a means of achieving greater discipline in the National Assembly by limiting the exuberance of the representatives. The person asked to formulate them was, naturally enough, Dr. Rusinian. Upon being finished, they were accepted unanimously and enthusiastically. So the Constitution went on functioning with varying degrees of success, and no serious attempt was or could have been made to suspend it by any segment of the community. Today it is still the document which governs the Armenian communities of Syria and Lebanon.

The Armenian National Constitution represented the culmination of a movement whose roots lay deep in the life of the Armenian community in Turkey and which received its impetus from such external events as the declaration of T'anzimat' (1839), the Treaty of Paris (1856), Hat't'i-Humayun of 1856, and the experiences and activities of the Renaissance Generation. Then, the Constitution, itself, became a factor in the progress of the movement which sought to achieve (1) security of life, property, and honor, (2) equality before the law, (3) freedom from oppression by corrupt government officials, and (4) an end to the abuses connected with the collection of taxes.³⁶ After the Treaty of San Stefano (1878), this movement became known as the Armenian Question, and when all diplomatic and peaceful efforts failed, it culminated in the revolutionary movement which provoked such severe retaliatory measures by the Hamidian and young Turkish regimes that it practically wiped out the Armenian population under Turkish rule.³⁷

The agitation for a more democratic national administration coincided with a deep-seated patriotic movement aided by Chamchian's historical work. It was not until the 1840-1860 period that it expanded sufficiently to assume popular proportions in Constantinople. Its expansion into

the provinces came even later. The two decades which occupied the middle of the century were two decades of intensive activity by the Renaissance Generation. The intense patriotic feeling which they harbored was gradually transmitted to their contemporaries. The ardor with which they worked won them admiration and friends, while at the same time it made them enemies.

One of the most important figures in the literary wing of the Renaissance Generation was Fr. Ghevont Alishan of the Mkhitarists of Venice. Born in 1820 in Constantinople, he found himself at the Mkhitarist school in Venice in his early adolescence, and there he was brought up in an atmosphere in which the spirit of Italian and Armenian patriotism joined hands with literary Romanticism. Manzoni, Mazzini, Garibaldi, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Vigny, and Hugo ruled the minds and passions, and the young boy, who was in the process of becoming a priest, felt their irresistible influence. He, himself, as a teacher, left his mark on such men as Ajemian, T'ghlian, T'erzian, and Arp'arian, who had the good fortune to study with him. Beshigt'ashlian, too, had the opportunity to come in contact with him when he spent a brief period at the monastery of St. Lazarus. Yet it was not necessary to have personal association in order to catch the contagious germs of this sincere poet. Raffi,³⁸ Kamañ-K'at'iba,³⁹ Dzerent's, Mamurian, Khrimian,⁴⁰ Nalbantian,⁴¹ and Ardzruni⁴² felt his influence by reading his poetic and prose writing. This man, who had never set foot on Armenian soil, but for whom love of the land of his ancestors was a master passion, slept with a small bagful of Armenian earth under his pillow.⁴³ When he wrote the history or the geography of his country, he pursued more than a scholarly goal. He sought to tell his countrymen of the glories of a once proud race, the grandeur of the forbidding mountains, and the warmth of the fertile valleys of his country. His work stands out more for its lyricism than for its scholarship, but in volume after

volume the reader sees a long line of national heroes and heroines come to life under the pen of a nineteenth-century monk in order to remind their descendants of their past. As he wends his imaginary way with religious reverence through the valleys, over the mountains, along the rivers, and through a maze of historic cities and towns, he is writing more than history and geography. In the best tradition of Moses of Khoren and Chamchian, he is seeking to appeal to the noblest sentiments of his people through their mind and heart. Only the fifth volume of his *Songs*⁴⁴ was accessible to the general public since it was the only one written mostly in *asharhapar*. Hence, it alone could exert an influence on them, but his other volumes, as well as his historical works, left their mark on the intellectuals.⁴⁵ The following four stanzas come from one of the best known of his poems:

Here where our matchless, brave Armenian fathers
 Fell as giants, as angels to rise anew,
 Com'st thou⁴⁶ to spread o'er the bones of the saints a cover
 Of golden thread, from thy cloud of snowy hue?

Nightingale, voice of the night, little soul of the roses,
 Friend of all mournful hearts that with sorrow are sighing!
 Sing, little nightingale, sing me a song from that hillock,
 Sing with my song of Armenia's heroes undying!

If like the voice of a nightingale faint and weary,
 Sons of Togarmah,⁴⁷ my voice shall reach your ears,
 Sons of the great, whose valiant and virtuous fathers
 Filled plains, books, and the heavens, in former years,—

If one small drop of blood from Armenia's fountain,
 The fount of a Bahlav, flow into your bosom's sea,—
 If you would that your country's glories for you be written,
 Come forth to Ardaz with your Patriarch, come with me!⁴⁸

Armenian patriotic poems were very much in demand from 1850 to 1890. Bedros Turian (1851-1872) spent part of his youthful talent writing about his people, but he was concerned with the present. His poems were expressions of love for his country and people or lamentations over their suffering at the hands of Turks, Kurds, and Circassians. The following illustrates our point:⁴⁹

No more for the Armenian
 A twinkling star appears;
 His spirit's flowers have faded
 Beneath a rain of tears.
 Ceased are the sounds of harmless mirth,
 The dances hand in hand;
 Only the weapon of the Koord
 Shines freely through the land.



Give back our sisters' roses,
 Our brothers who have died,
 The crosses of our churches,
 Our nation's peace and pride!
 O Sultan, we demand of thee
 And with our hearts entreat—
 Give us protection from the Koord,
 Or arms his arms to meet!⁵⁰

It would be easy to multiply these citations from writers like Terzian, Beshigt'ashlian, Narbey, and others if further evidence were needed to show the state of mind of the people and the poets.

Alishan fed the minds of the people from within the dark walls of his monastery, but there was a man who was writing and acting in Turkey and its Armenian provinces. He was Mgrdich Khrimian (1820-1906), later called Hayrig (diminutive of hayr—father) by the Armenians in recognition of the paternal tenderness he showed toward his people. Born and educated in Van, he left his native city in

order to become better acquainted with his people by traveling through other parts of Armenia. At first more interested in education than religion, he did not enter the church until his return from his second trip to Constantinople at the age of thirty-three, when he found his mother and wife dead. In Constantinople for the third time (1854) as a priest, he participated in the activity which led to the adoption of the Constitution. There he began the publication of his *Eagle of Vasburagan*.⁵¹ For several years, he wandered from place to place as prior and prelate, but always attending to the education of the clergy and the people through the establishment of a press and the publication of his paper. One year after his ordination as bishop, he became Patriarch of Constantinople.⁵²

Armenians had mixed feelings in those days. They were enjoying more freedom than before in Constantinople and in other cosmopolitan centers. They had a National Constitution whose creaking operations were a source of satisfaction and malcontent at the same time. On the other hand, the people in the provinces were just as insecure and downtrodden as they had ever been. The songs of Turian and others were not mere rhetorical or sentimental outbursts. They had a basis in fact. It was hoped that the election of this indefatigable patriot would at least partially cure their ills. Khrimian, himself, analyzed the situation thus:

You expected Khrimian to add to the glory of the Armenian Church. You expected him to overcome the corruptness of church officials. You expected that by incessantly preaching school, education, light, etc., he would guide the ship of national progress and would steer it toward its goal. In addition to this expectation, there was another one, namely: that Khrimian as a Patriarch who was a partisan of the Constitution would be capable of quickly lifting the Constitution on his eagle's wings and of carrying and depositing it on the land of the Armenians, of baptizing collectively the city dweller and the villager, the

learned and the ignorant, and enlightening them and forming a constitutional people out of them. More than this, the greatest expectation of the people of the provinces was that, now that Khrimian is Patriarch, we will be freed from all the pressures of oppression. . . . When I took this office I thought only this: let me go and occupy the Patriarchal See, and perhaps from that center of authority I shall be capable of finding a remedy for the many needs of the Nation.⁵³

This was not empty oratory. His actions are eloquent proof of the sincerity and seriousness with which he approached his nation's problems. From the very first day he sought to ameliorate the condition of the provincials which he knew so well through direct contact and experience. True to the statement made in his acceptance speech upon election to office, he became the representative of all the people and made repeated efforts to induce the Sublime Porte to replace words with action. He sought an end to the oppressive conduct of corrupt officials and the marauding bands of armed tribesmen, who roamed the countryside with impunity and pillaged, raped, and killed unmolested, at times with official connivance. The Christian rayas were neither protected nor allowed to possess arms in order to protect themselves. When, frustrated by actions of the National Assembly and the duplicity of the Sublime Porte, he resigned his post in 1873, he could honestly say that he had done all he could to improve the lot of his people, but unfortunately circumstances were against him. However, even after his resignation, he continued to work in various capacities.

The worst was yet to come. In despair, completely abandoning hope of attaining reforms from the Turk through remonstrances, the Armenians attempted to use pressure from outside at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878. They persuaded the Russian government to insert article sixteen in the Treaty of San Stefano whereby the Sublime Porte was obliged to promise immediate

reforms in the Armenian provinces. What western interests, especially British, did to that article are well known facts. At the Congress of Berlin suddenly the numbers were reserved in spite of Armenian efforts and vague promises by British, French, and other diplomats. Article sixteen became article sixty-one and lost all its teeth in the process. England now assumed the protection of Turkey against Russia but elicited a promise for reforms. The Armenian delegation headed by Khrimian returned with even less than the proverbial half a loaf. The Hamidian government never carried out the reforms in spite of the tepid efforts of the Great Powers.

The peaceful attempts made by the Armenians had proven their complete futility. Khrimian continued to write and to work for his people. As in the case of his contemporary, Alishan, his profound love for his country inspired and colored his writing. His own disciples, such as Sr-vantzdyan's, became imbued with that ardor and dedicated their lives to the Armenian people. Raffi was probably more influenced by him than by Alishan, for his novels bear traces of his contact with Khrimian. This heroic figure, whose spirit had a profound impact on his contemporaries, became elected Catholicos of all the Armenians (1892) in which capacity he fought for his spiritual flock like a father for his child and richly merited the name of Hayrig.⁵⁴

With the failure of peaceful means, violence was inevitable. The liberal ideas of '89, '30, and '48, the native patriotic spirit intensified by the French and Italian influences, the spirit of nationalism sweeping eastward over Europe, the successes of Montenegro, Serbia, Greece, Roumania, and Bulgaria in their efforts to win independence or autonomy, the existence of a National Constitution, which in spite of its imperfections gave the nation a representative administration and by so doing established closer ties between the Capital and provinces, the presence of a substantial number of intellectuals all militated against a return to the state of

passive servitude. Therefore, when Hamidian duplicity became obvious, a revolutionary movement began to take shape. Places like Zeyt'un, which had been able to maintain a semi-independent state due to their geographical location, had unfurled the banner of revolt (1860) when subjected to too much pressure, but these were unorganized and sporadic occurrences. The revolutionary committees did not come into existence until after the futility of article sixty-one of the Treaty of Berlin became obvious. Local committees were formed in Garin and Van before 1885. In that year the Armenagan party came into being in Van through the efforts of the former students of Mgrdich P'ort'ukalian, who had had to flee to Marseilles because of his revolutionary ideas. In 1887, thus far the strongest political party was formed by a handful of Armenian students in Geneva. The Hnchagian party was influenced by the socialistic ideas which were spreading through Europe at that time. Hence, the addition of "So'tsial Temograd" (Social Democrat) before the "Hnchagian." Its aim was the complete liberation of Armenia through revolution. In Tiflis, three years later, was born the Hay Heghap'okhagan Tashnagt'sut'yun (Armenian Revolutionary Federation), whose aim was the improvement of the lot of their compatriots in Turkish Armenia through revolution. Thus, what had begun as a peaceful attempt at persuading the Turkish government to grant the basic human rights had reached the point of violence because of the refusal of that government to grant them. The ruthless suppression of all manifestations, peaceful or otherwise, earned Sultan Hamid the titles of the "Great Assassin," and the "Red Sultan." The Young Turks, who had at first sought the assistance and cooperation of the Armenian political parties, later turned against them and finished the work that Hamid had started.⁵⁵ The year 1915 gave the Turks the opportunity to carry out their plan of obliterating the Armenians in Turkey. Outside of Constantinople, there are relatively few Armenians left in Turkish

Armenia, for most of those who escaped the desert and the sword left the country when given the opportunity. There is no political freedom worth mentioning any more than there is real intellectual life. The platitudes which appear in the Armenian press cry out more loudly than blatant condemnations concerning the stifling hand of the Turkish censor. Armenian history books are still contraband. Just what the future holds for those who still live there is difficult to say, but past experience and present conditions preclude any great optimism regarding them.

REFERENCES

1. Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 104-105. Ormanian mentions only the economic council. Ormanian, *History of the Armenian Church*, Vol. III, pp. 3727-3729.
2. Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 110-111, 227.
3. Ormanian, *History of the Armenian Church*, Vol. III, pp. 3729-3735, 3794-3798, 3813-3814; P. K'echian, *History of the Armenian Holy Saviour Hospital of Constantinople*, pp. 92-93.
4. Ormanian, *History of the Armenian Church*, Vol. III, pp. 3877-3880. The date 1848 is interesting, if not significant, in the light of the events which had taken place in France earlier that year.
5. Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, pp. 115-116.
6. Odian, *op. cit.*, p. IX. The italicizing of *Orthology* is ours. That of *Educational* belongs to the author.
7. K'echian, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-139. Ormanian, *History of the Armenian Church*, Vol. III, pp. 4015-4020; Asadur, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 81-82.
8. *Armenian National Constitution*, p. 1.
9. The Declaration of the Rights of Man had been presented to the Convention by Robespierre in 1793, preceding the Constitution of that year. It was revived by the Société des Droits de l'Homme in 1833. In our discussions, we shall refer to the version of this document found in Louis Blanc, *History of Ten Years, 1830-1840*, Vol. II, pp. 188-190, n. There seems to be some variation between different versions. Cf. F. M. Anderson, *The Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France*, pp. 160-164.
10. *Armenian National Constitution*, p. 1.
11. Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 61.
12. Constitutional Charters of 1814 and 1830.
13. Blanc, *op. cit.*, p. 189, Article XII.

14. *Armenian National Constitution*, pp. 1-2.
15. Blanc, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
16. *Armenian National Constitution*, p. 2.
17. Blanc, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189. The italicizing in the last two citations is ours.
18. Cf. H. C. Lockwood, *Constitutional History of France*, pp. 383-395.
19. Constitution of 1791, Chapter II, articles 3-4; 1793 arts. 71-72; 1795, art. 152; 1799, arts. 72-73; 1814, art. 74; 1815, art. 40; 1830, art. 47; 1848, art. 68. These designations are according to those found in Lockwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 273-395.
20. Constitutions of 1795, 1814, 1815, 1830.
21. *Armenian National Constitution*, arts. 24-25.
22. *Ibid.*, arts. 65-66.
23. Constitution of 1791, Section II, art. 2; Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 513-514.
24. *Armenian National Constitution*, art. 68.
25. The Protestants and Catholics were called "Prot'est'an millet'i" and "K'at'olig millet'i" respectively.
26. The Religious Council was elected from a triple list of candidates submitted by the National Synod to the National Assembly according to articles twenty-four and twenty-five of the Constitution.
27. *Armenian National Constitution*, arts. 45-46.
28. *Ibid.*, art. 47.
29. *Ibid.*, arts. 48-49.
30. *Ibid.*, art. 50.
31. *Ibid.*, art. 51.
32. Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*, p. 129.
33. Odian, *op. cit.*, pp. XI-XII.
34. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 210.
35. M. Khrimian, in a speech before the National Assembly on January 26, 1873, cited by S. Sahbaz in "Our National Constitution," *Baik'ar Annual*, 1957, p. 25.
36. A. O. Sarkissian, *History of the Armenian Question to 1885*, p. 37.
37. For a treatment of the Armenian Question and for documents, see P'asdermadjian, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-421; Sarkissian, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-114; Varantian, *op. cit.*, Vol. II; Macler, *Autour de l'Arménie*; M. Léart, *La Question Arménienne à la lumière des documents*.
38. Eastern Armenian novelist (1835-1888), who contributed greatly to the expansion of the feeling of nationalism among the Armenians with his *Tjalettin* (1878), *The Fool* (1880) and *Sparks* (Vol. I, 1883, Vol. II, 1887), and others.
39. Eastern Armenian poet (1830-1872).
40. See below, pp. 128-130.
41. Eastern Armenian poet (1830-1866).
42. Eastern Armenian journalist (1845-1892).
43. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 56.

44. They were written between 1840 and 1852 but published in a collection in 1857-1858.

45. For a full discussion of the life and works of Alishan, see Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 49-190; Chobanian, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 85-104; Janashian, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 136-160.

46. Nightingale of Avarayr.

47. Legendary ancestor of Armenians.

48. "The Nightingale of Avarayr," translated by Alice Stone Blackwell, *Armenian Poems*, pp. 107-109.

49. He wrote also some highly personal poetry in the tradition of Musset and Lamartine which will be discussed later in connection with literature.

50. "New Dark Days," translated by Blackwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-24.

51. He later published also *Eagle of Daron*.

52. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-106; Varantian, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 292-314; Chobanian, *Profiles*, Vol. I, pp. 113-132.

53. Khrimian, "Speech of Resignation," Aug. 3, 1873, in *Complete Works*, Appendix, B8-B9.

54. After his election, Khrimian discovered that he had exchanged a hostile sultan for a hostile czar (for Erevan was in the Russian zone of Armenia), but he spent the remaining sixteen years of his life protecting his church and people as best he could.

55. In 1913, T'alet' P'asha, the half-Turk half-Gypsy, who had become Minister of the Interior, had said the following words in the Armenian Cathedral on the occasion of the Celebration of the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the Armenian Bible: "They awakened us and showed us the road to freedom." Anaïs, *Mémoires*, p. 203. It was this same man who ordered the massacre of the Armenians two years later.

The Armenian Press

Before the Constitution became a reality, there were other urgent problems which needed attention. One of these was the absence of a regularly functioning press. The importance of the press in public education and the formation of public opinion was just as obvious then as it is today. Long before the Renaissance Generation, others had felt its need and had even made efforts to fill the vacuum, but with ephemeral or no success.

It was an obscure priest, Harut'yun K'ahana Shmavonian of Shiraz who founded the *Monitor*, the first Armenian periodical, in Madras, India, on October 16, 1794. This was five years after he had founded a printing press with great personal sacrifice in time, money, and effort and ten years after the establishment of the *Calcutta Gazette* in Calcutta, India. However, the publication which served as an example and which he admittedly followed was a "notebook" published in Madras, just a month before his own successful effort. Primarily a businessman's monthly, written in classical Armenian, the *Monitor* concerned itself mostly with news and articles of interest to the merchants. Businessmen, themselves, in and outside of India contributed articles and even unpoetic poems. However Father Shmavonian did not neglect the life of Armenians at home and abroad. He welcomed informative articles about events in Armenian communities everywhere. He even took upon himself the task

of improving their condition through the elimination of their greatest vices—ignorance, excessive individualism, and disunity. The *Monitor* came to an end in March, 1796, but the didactic and moralizing tendency of Father Shmavonian, devoid of any real critical analysis or scientific attack on specific problems, continued to dominate the Armenian press for the next half a century.¹

Three years after the demise of the *Monitor*, the first of Father Injijian's *Annals* came off the press (Venice) and was followed by others until 1802. *Byzantine Season* was distinguished from its predecessor not only by its more picturesque name but also by its character. Whereas the former was primarily concerned with social and political events, the latter seems to have had more the form and contents of an almanac with informational articles on natural sciences and with weather predictions for the ensuing year. Father Injijian was able to continue the publication of this annual until 1820.²

Other periodicals appeared during the first half of the nineteenth century. The *Byzantine Observer* (1812-1816), a semi-monthly (Venice), *Polyhistory* (1843-), a monthly (Venice), *Europe* (1847-1863), a weekly (Vienna), *Newsletter of the Great Ottoman Empire* or *T'ak'vimi-Vek'ayi* (as known in Turkish) (1832-1833) the first Armenian weekly (Constantinople),³ *Treasury of Useful Knowledge* (1839-1853), illustrated monthly published by the Protestants in Smyrna, *Dawn of Ararat* (1840-1887), first a weekly and later a daily (Smyrna), *Byzantine Monitor* (1840-1841), a weekly (Constantinople), and *Armenia* (1846-1852), a weekly (Constantinople) are some of the many journals which appeared on the nineteenth-century scene before the Armenian Renaissance had gathered full momentum.⁴ All the above named were in the vernacular, because they all catered to a larger public than was represented by those who were conversant with classical Armenian. According to T'orosian, approximately twenty-five journals were

founded from 1800-1850 of which nearly one half were born in the fifth decade. Perhaps even more significant is the fact that twenty-five others were established between 1850 and 1860.⁵

1852 saw the passing of *Armenia* and the birth of *Masis*. *Armenia* had been published under the direction and with the financial support of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When dissatisfaction with Deroyent's' views and policies grew intense, the Supreme (or Secular) Council withdrew its support, and the paper died.⁶ Fortunately, Garabed Ūt'ūjian had just returned from Paris after completing his studies at the Sorbonne and the Collège de France.⁷ The Patriarchate invited him to take charge with the understanding that he would have complete freedom in the editing and management of the paper.⁸ Beginning on February 2, 1852, it rendered distinguished service for fifty-six years, until its publication ceased in 1908. At first a weekly, it changed several times to a daily, a semi-monthly, a tri-weekly and back again, but it always remained the most highly esteemed periodical in Constantinople.⁹ Ajañian lavishes the following praise on *Masis*:

The latter [*Masis*] became the greatest laboratory of the Armenian mind. It was there that were created, proposed, criticized, formed and received "droit de cité" a large number of new Armenian words related to scientific, literary, educational, and public life, and many idioms used in formal language. (And) if today we, Armenians, have a more or less cultivated, regular, scientific, and formal language, it is due in large measure to the important role played by *Masis* in its development.¹⁰

Ūt'ūjian was not the radical that N. Balian and Rusinian were, but he, too, had seen the same Paris with all its pre-occupations and agitations. He, too, was moved by the patriotic spirit so characteristic of his generation. When he took charge, he declared that his aim was "to improve, to

enlighten, and to help the nation.”¹¹ His profession of faith went on to say:

It is our opinion that until a person is educated and enlightened, he can serve neither his God nor his sovereign properly. It is our opinion that for the welfare of the individual, as well as that of the nation, it is necessary to give the individual an intellectual, moral, and practical education simultaneously, and in order to facilitate this effort and to crown it with success, it is necessary to be especially unsparing in our attention to the proper education of girls.

It is our opinion that in order to destroy the seeds of poverty in a nation, it is necessary, on the one hand, to spread enlightenment and to develop certain skills through well organized schools, and on the other, to cultivate the desire for virtue, diligence, economy, and self-sufficiency.¹²

In order to spread enlightenment among the people, one had to speak their language. That is precisely what Üt'üjian proposed to do, but in keeping with his own principles, he intended to improve and polish the language of his readers and to bring it closer to the classical. In that way, not only their minds but also their speech would develop. His attitude toward classical Armenian and the vernacular is typical of his tendency. He was a liberal, but he was not so liberal as to be unable to find a meeting ground with conservatives in the national administration. He was, in a sense, the connecting link between young and old, between conservatives and radicals, between Rusinian and the amiras.

Üt'üjian was a constitutionalist (sahmanatragan). His being in control of an instrument such as *Masis* would facilitate the acceptance of the idea of a Constitution and the Constitution, itself, if it needed assistance from the press. Üt'üjian was surrounded by the liberal-minded young men who had walked the pavements of the Latin Quarter, who had sat in the classrooms of the Sorbonne and all the other institutions whose thresholds they had crossed with

reverence, and where they had listened with ill-concealed thrill to the idols of France and of liberal Europe. He went to work with the hearty support and cooperation of Zorayian, Mamurian, and others outside the Patriarchate, while his other friends, Servichen, Odian, and Ėusinian, worked from within to give a definite character to the life of the Capital "by adopting the role of followers of French thought."¹³

The utilitarian concept was characteristic not only of Üt'üjian, but also of his generation and the generation which followed. Their primary aim was to aid the nation, and every literary activity was subordinated to that goal. Art for art's sake was a luxury which men dedicated to practical goals could not afford or even imagine. First, they had to act. If their actions needed the assistance of the pen, they wrote. One of the first things Zorayian did on his return to Constantinople was to write articles dealing with national education and economics in *Armenia*, whose editorial staff he joined with nine other well-educated young men.¹⁴

For Dzerent's, making speeches in all corners of Constantinople on behalf of the Constitution, writing patriotic and historical novels, and teaching youngsters to read, to write, and to love their country was more important than practicing medicine.¹⁵ Berberian, the incorrigible Romanticist, entered educational work and for more than thirty years proclaimed the philosophy of "the true, the beautiful, and the good" in order to give his nation intellectually and morally well-educated young men and women.¹⁶ Arp'iar Arp'iarian, a man of real literary talent, joined one of the Armenian political parties, suffered poverty and exile, and cultivated literature only in his leisure moments or as a means of awakening the people to the need of cooperative effort to avert the national disaster that seemed to be brewing in the Turkish mind. He wrote, and he wrote a great deal, but most of that was not literature in the narrow sense

of the word. He had put his pen at the disposal of his nation.¹⁷ Minas Cheraz spent the early part of his life in the political and diplomatic field in an effort to obtain reforms from the Turks by bringing international pressure to bear on them. When he was not writing on some subject related to the immediate need of his people, he was busy founding *L'Arménie* in Paris as a medium through which to make Armenians known to Europeans. The *Revue des Revues*, *Revue d'Europe*, *La France littéraire*, and other French papers published his articles. *L'Orient inédit*, *Poètes arméniens*, and *Nouvelles orientales* were volumes which came to supplement his other work, always with the same goal.¹⁸ Arshag Chobanian, even before he settled in Paris, was talking of literature in utilitarian terms. After he settled there, he, too, devoted a large proportion of his time to the task of acquainting the French with Armenian culture.¹⁹ Yeghya Demirjibashian, a real artist, felt frustrated and experienced "a bitter pleasure cursing my calling, which demands *art for the sake of morality rather than art for the sake of art.*"²⁰ It was difficult for these men to see an educated generation returning from Paris in 1892 and not participating actively in the affairs of the nation.²¹ When contemporaries of Vosgan heard of his death, they regretted his departure from this earth, but they regretted much more the fact that he had abandoned his people by devoting his last thirty-four years to the French community in Smyrna as the editor of *La Réforme*.

The utilitarianism of the press is reaffirmed in 1898 in a statement of policy by *Masis*:

To bring out the beneficial aspects of daily life, to improve the minds of our readers and, by cultivating their taste,²² to ennoble their sentiments will be the policy followed by the semi-monthly *Masis*.²³

As one examines carefully the pages of the various reviews, one sees the wide scope of this program. Articles

on Chinese and Australian manners may be found side by side with articles on French literature. Medicine, astronomy, hygiene, Armenian folklore, geography, practical arts, agriculture, linguistics, Armenian literature, biography, history, economics, international events, anthropology, and many other subjects²⁴ fill the pages of Armenian periodicals in order to expose the mind to as many different aspects of physical and intellectual life as possible. In this respect, the example of such a periodical as the *Revue des deux mondes* cannot be discounted, especially when the background of the men behind the press is borne in mind. Next to Armenian subjects and authors, French subjects and authors occupy the most important place on the pages of *Masis*, *Orient*, *Fatherland*.²⁵ It is impossible to dislodge them even after a concerted effort is made to modify the situation for the "good" of Armenian life through greater emphasis on the literature and history of the North. Translations of scientific articles by such men as Camille Flammarion vie with the translations of works of literature. Important events in France find their echoes in Armenian newspapers and periodicals. A speech by a newly-elected member of the French Academy upon his formal acceptance into that august body is an event not to be neglected. Even an unsuccessful candidacy by Zola is news worth publishing. A new theatrical success or even a new literary triumph by an already well-known author has a place in the columns of the Armenian press, and the reporting of these events follows the French patterns in form as well as in content. Any idea which appears in the French press and which seems applicable to the local situation is sure to appear on the pages of Armenian journals in its original or in a slightly modified form. The problem of morality in literature is discussed almost simultaneously in the French and Armenian presses. A French journal asks famous men of letters to describe how they write. It seems a good idea to an Armenian editor, too. Thus, we see a series of short,

and sometimes illuminating articles by the best known Armenian writers of the day entitled "How I Write."²⁶ The imitation is carried even to the editing of Armenian news according to Dikran Arp'iarian, who spent his life editing and writing for *Masis*, *Orient*, and other publications. In reminiscing on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Orient*, he states that when he began to work for that newspaper, it was his duty to edit the local news "*according to the pattern of French newspapers*"²⁷ and the chroniques of the Patriarchate. A few years earlier, in one of his numerous articles dealing with French and Armenian literatures, Mercedes had stated that "both the reviews and dailies were without exception always patterned upon and followed the direction of the French."²⁸ In some cases, even their formats were similar.

From the very first day, the Armenian school became one of the principal preoccupations of the press, and such it remained to the very end. Upon the effectiveness of the school, depended the intellectual development of the nation. Hence, the veritable stream of articles dealing with school buildings, sanitation, program of studies, teacher preparation, vocational education, girls' education, social usefulness of the individual, and many other aspects. There was hardly an issue which did not contain an article dealing with national administration, language, or schools. It is not unusual to find a treatment of two or even three of them in one issue of a monthly, weekly, or a daily.

Nevertheless, there were more than three facets to Armenian life. There was the great problem of arousing the national sentiment among a people who had been too busy for centuries trying to protect their life, honor, and property. It was necessary to transform them from a semidormant mass to an alert and proud nation. Books were not nearly as practical and accessible as newspapers for various reasons not the least of which was their susceptibility to censorship. The press, too, was under censorship, but the censor

had to be somewhat more hasty in his examination of newspaper articles, which had to meet a deadline than with books, which he could retain in order to study more carefully.²⁹ Even then, it was not infrequent for one or more installments of feuilleton literature to be held up by one of Abdul-Hamid's censors. Most of the volumes appearing at this time were translations, textbooks, or dictionaries. Thus, the press opened its pages wide to those who wished to try their hand at writing of any kind. Many were the young men and women who put pen to paper for the satisfaction of seeing their names in print or for doing their modest bit for the education of the public. Some began to write before they left the classroom.

With Armenia divided among three neighbors, there was also the question of making each segment aware of the problems of the others and of instilling a spirit of comradeship among them. The newspapers of Constantinople wrote about the events in Russian Armenia, as those in Russian Armenia did the same for the Western Armenians. The press in Tiflis printed articles by Constantinopolitans, and the latter reciprocated. Large amounts of Caucasian money went into the coffers of western educational associations to be used for the opening and maintenance of schools in the Armenian provinces of Turkey.

Religious animosities had somewhat subsided after the recognition of the Catholics and Protestants as separate communities, but they were far from being dead. While the press refrained from printing violent attacks, it reflected the ideas and sentiments which existed in the minds of the people. Writers strove for unity, but there was always the underlying feeling that Catholicism and Protestantism had weakened the nation by dividing it. If they attacked the Armenian Church, it was not always because of hostility to the church or to the clergy but rather because of a desire to strengthen it by eliminating abuses.

Migration from the provinces to Constantinople was

another grave problem. More than one author was seriously concerned with the misery of these immigrants and their families left in the provinces. Hrant (Melkon Gürjian) devoted all his literary activity to the description of the wretched life of these unfortunates who, due to economic necessity, had left their parents, wives, and children and were walking the pavements of the Capital as carriers or laborers of various kinds. It is estimated that there were between 30,000 and 50,000 such persons in Constantinople in the seventies.³⁰

Strictly speaking, this was not a press of ideas. It could not have been, in spite of the reforms of the 30's and the 50's. The one field which could be discussed on a human and philosophical basis—the political field—was closed to discussion. Where a Turk might discuss such things as liberty, equality, and justice at the risk of exile or imprisonment, an Armenian would do it at the risk of his life and the life of his family. Moreover, if too many had the courage to do so, they might lose the little that they had gained during the reigns of Mahmud II and Abdul-Mejid. If the easy-going Abdul-Aziz felt the need for stringent control of the press through regulatory laws, the suspicious Abdul-Hamid felt it even more. In the words of a Turkish writer: "Not only was suspension of papers by the government an everyday occurrence, but also journalists were exiled without trial."³¹

With this field closed, and with the almost superhuman task of revivifying their nation lying before them, the little bands of journalists gathered around Ūt'ūjian, Khrimian, Balt'azarian, and later Arp'iarian, Zohrab, K'echian, and others devoted their attention to internal, practical problems. Outside of Demirjibashian's *Literary and Philosophical Movement*, there were no journals with philosophical pretensions. The three descriptive words found under the name of a daily or periodical were "national, literary, and political,"³² combined in different ways to suit a particular

publication. *The Bee*, which became a satirical semi-monthly under H. Baronian, *Light*, and one or two others had a somewhat different character, but they aspired to the same thing—to help improve their people individually and collectively. In attacking Armenian institutions, traditions, and contemporary life, they were pitiless, but every year from 1877 to 1908, on the birthday of Abdul-Hamid, they were obliged to make meaningless literary genuflections before the tyrant. In spite of all these difficulties, however, Armenian publications flourished so that by 1872, according to Ahmed Emin Bey, there were the following publications in Turkey: ten Turkish, seven French, eleven Armenian, seven Greek, four Bulgarian, and one Hebrew.³³ An analysis of the relative numbers gives eloquent testimony to the effort made by the Armenians in this as in every other cultural field.

Nevertheless, darker days were ahead. With Hamid's ascension, the strangulation of the press began in earnest. In less than a year, the Turkish newspapers had to agree that "the press in Turkey no longer existed as a factor in public life."³⁴ The Armenian press as a whole continued to function, and even to grow, by focussing its attention on internal problems, but the '90's saw its deterioration as public demonstrations by revolutionists grew, massacres were perpetrated, and the intellectuals went to prison or into exile. Suspensions, lowering of standards of quality, and restriction of subjects beset the papers. A temporary freedom in 1908 was merely a short respite before the end in 1915.

Once it assumed a permanent character, the press became a powerful force in the life of the Armenian community. It joined forces with the workers and orators on behalf of the Armenian National Constitution. It helped to bring about greater unity among the people by awakening the dormant sentiment of patriotism and by establishing closer ties between the eastern and western Armenians. It

attacked ignorance and mediocrity, and it helped to spread the love of reading and learning among the humble people. In all this, it was not the only force operating for the benefit of the nation, but it was one of the most powerful. The Armenian Renaissance owes a great deal to a press which flourished in the hands or under the leadership of the devoted men who, having been exposed to and inspired by the highest ideals during their sojourn in France, tried to help their people to rise above their stultifying milieu.

REFERENCES

1. Leo, *History of the Armenian People*, Vol. II, pp. 1048-1054.
2. There is a slight difference in the dates of publication given for these two annuals by Asadur and Janashian. The former's dates are 1800-1803 and 1804-1820 respectively, whereas the latter's are 1799-1802 and 1803-1820. We have followed the latter on the assumption that, being a Mkhitarist like Injijian, and writing in Venice at a later date than Asadur, he had access to material which was unavailable to the latter. Cf. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 46 and 111-112; and Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. IX.
3. *T'ak'vimi-Vek'ayi* was officially a Turkish paper. *Lro Kir Medzi Derut'ionn Osmanian* was the Armenian version of it. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 461.
4. Asadur, *op. cit.*, pp. IX-XIV.
5. Torosian, *op. cit.*, p. 266.
6. "Masis Today" (editorial), *Masis*, May 1, 1888, p. 1.
7. He had gone to Paris in 1848 to study business. It was after he had finished his studies in the business school that he had attended the lectures at the Sorbonne and the Collège de France. Michelet, in particular, had left an indelible mark on his mind. He returned to Constantinople in 1851. Asadur, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48. According to Sarkissian, "Up to the 'seventies the leadership in Armenian journalism was held by men who, for the most part, were trained in France and worked in Constantinople or in Smyrna; until then the Armenians of the Russian Empire were more or less imitators of these men; they usually followed the example set before them by the editors and publicists in the two cosmopolitan cities of the Ottoman Empire." Sarkissian, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
8. "Masis Today" (editorial), *Masis*, May 1, 1888, p. 1.
9. Janashian, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
10. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 494.
11. Alboyajian, "A Fifty-year Anniversary," *Masis*, Feb. 3, 1901, p. 66.
12. G. Ut'ujian, "The Year 1852 and Yesterday," *Masis*, Jan. 1, 1900, pp. 4-5.

13. Alboyajian, "A Fifty-year Anniversary," *Masis*, Feb. 3, 1901, p. 67.

14. See above, p. 105 for the publication of *Love of Reading* and the formation of reading societies.

15. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 48, 192.

16. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 346-348.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 419-439.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 349-351.

19. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 494-497.

20. Y. Demirjibashian, "Confessions to Hrachia," *Literary and Philosophical Movement*, 1883, pp. 165-166.

21. Fndk'lian, "Our New Generation Returning from Paris," *Masis*, Dec. 31, 1892, pp. 287-288.

22. In comparing this with the avowed aims of Ut'ujian, we find an evolution in *Masis'* aims with the addition of an aesthetic element, even though this, too, is to be with an utilitarian purpose, namely: to "ennoble" the sentiments of the people.

23. *Masis*, December 5, 1898, p. 1.

24. This is a partial list of the general headings under which subjects were treated in *Masis* in 1884-1885.

25. *Orient* was a daily founded in 1884. *Fatherland* had come into being as a weekly in 1870 but had changed to a daily in 1891. Note that the French translations—*l'Orient* and *La Patrie* sound more natural than the English.

26. Of the 237 titles (articles, poems, short stories, biographies, etc.) in the one-year period extending from August 4, 1884 to July 27, 1885, *Masis* devoted forty-two to things French. There were six others which were translations of articles by Frenchmen. Thus, the total number of items having some connection with France becomes forty-eight. This is nearly seven times as many titles as were devoted to things Italian and almost nine times as many as were devoted to things English. Perhaps even more significant is the analysis of some of the categories. Among the ten biographies, five titles are devoted to French authors, two to British, one to Russian, and one to German figures. Literature is the field where French completely dominates the scene. Of the forty-one poems published in *Masis*, nine were translations of French poems, four translations of Italian poems, and one the translation of an Italian poem written by an Armenian. Among the twenty-seven short stories published, twenty are translations from French authors, and seven are original.

27. D. Arp'arian, "Souvenirs of Editorial Life," Jan. 2, 1908, p. 182.

28. Mercedes, "A Misunderstanding," *Masis*, Aug. 10, 1902, p. 503.

29. A. Arp'arian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, pp. 74-77.

30. Sarkissian, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

31. A. Emin Bey, "The Turkish Press," in Mears, *Modern Europe*, p. 453.

32. "Political" was used to mean "national and international."

33. A. Emin Bey, in Mears, *op. cit.*, p. 454. The author does not state clearly whether these were the newspapers published in Constantinople or throughout the Empire.

34. The statement was made in August, 1877 by *T'erjumanî-Efk'iar*, published in the Turkish language but with Armenian letters and was echoed by the Turkish newspapers. A Emin Bey, in Mears, *op. cit.*, p. 455. For an account of the complete stifling of the press by 1897 and of how even the publication of fiction was prohibited because "it stimulated the imagination," see *Ibid.*, pp. 456-457.



Development of the Vernacular as a Literary Language

Since the invention of the alphabet in the fifth century, classical Armenian had been the language of literature, even after the development of dialects through the evolution of the popular language.¹ A considerable length of time had to elapse before the vernacular could replace krapar as a literary language. Its timid and sporadic appearances in the seventh and ninth centuries did not constitute a well established trend although they helped to serve as beginnings. By the twelfth century, the vernacular had become the official language of the Cilician court and kingdom. Treaties and all legal documents were in the vernacular, but classical Armenian still remained the language of the church, and since it was in the church that literature was made, it remained also the language of literature. Definite progress was made, however, when Shnorhali and Mkhitar Herat'si lent it the dignity and prestige of their pen. Thereafter, the language of the people encompassed a greater variety of subjects as an increasingly larger number of authors wrote for the public. Treatises on agriculture, animal husbandry, practical arts, astronomy, and medicine were sure to be in the vernacular, as were popular literature and poetry. While this represents an important step forward, it must not be construed to mean that the days of

krapar were over. On the contrary, the vernacular continued to live under the long and thick shadow of classical Armenian until a concerted effort on its behalf helped it to replace krapar as the literary language.²

The gap between the popular and written language grew steadily as lack of communication and successive waves of invasions and foreign influences made themselves felt on Armenian life. To Greek, Arabic, and Persian influences was added the Turkish, whose weight became greater in western Armenian as the hold of krapar on the popular language became more tenuous. Ajařian estimates that in 1902 there were 2100 Turkish words in the dialect of Van, 1170 in that of Nor Nakhichevan, 800 in that of Gharapagh, and the staggering total of 4000 in that of Constantinople.³ He further states that the language spoken in Constantinople and some other areas was not worthy of being called a language. Jargon would have been a more appropriate designation. This deterioration had reached the point where some people preferred Turkish or French to the "national" jargon.⁴

In some places, entire communities lost their Armenian completely and used the Turkish language in and out of the home although they attended church where the services were carried on in krapar.⁵ In Poland, in certain sections of Constantinople, and elsewhere, there even grew up an Armenian literature in Turkish written in Armenian characters. In addition to a number of newspapers in Constantinople, many poems by Armenian troubadours and a sizeable number of French masterpieces used this medium. Even the Protestant weekly, *Messenger*, of Smyrna, published by the American Board of Foreign Missions, used this means to reach the public. It is said that many Turks learned the Armenian alphabet in order to read these newspapers, which they found more stimulating than their own. This literature was particularly encouraged by some Armenian Catholics, who, wishing to get away from everything

Armenian, called themselves Franks and used the Turkish language.⁶ This extreme attitude later helped to create a reaction against the use of Turkish and in favor of the use and development of the Armenian vernacular.⁷

Faced with such handicaps, the evolution of western ashkharhapar could be expected to make only slow progress. Although the intensified religious struggle of the eighteenth century was mostly responsible for the early impetus, it cannot be said that it constituted the only motivating force. Patriarchs and other churchmen in Constantinople were composing secular and religious works decades before the publication of Mkhitar's grammar of the vernacular.⁸ However, the number of such works grew in number as the need for speaking and writing the people's language in the religious struggles became increasingly obvious. In the first three decades of the nineteenth century, forty books were printed in ashkharhapar.⁹

Between the prose written by Father Injijian in 1801¹⁰ and an epitaph written in 1836 (discovered by K. Fndk'lian in 1892)¹¹ there is already considerable progress. The vocabulary of Father Injijian's account of one of Lord Nelson's victories is still a mixture of Turkish, classical Armenian, and popular words not used in literature, whereas the six-line rhymed epitaph is pure and simple in vocabulary and composition.¹² It was three years later that the first Protestant periodical, *Treasury of Useful Knowledge* (1839-1854), was published in Smyrna. Undoubtedly, this publication and the translation of the Bible into ashkharhapar by the Protestants had some effect on the evolution of the vernacular, but in evaluating their contribution, it is necessary to remember that the Protestants represented a very small segment of the population and that before and after their arrival on the scene the great linguistic battles of the day were being waged mostly, if not entirely, outside their sphere of activity.

All this meant that, even before the appearance of *Masis*, considerable work had been done in ridding the spoken language of many of the Turkish, Arabic, and Persian words. There had even been some grammars which had tried to explain the vagaries of ashkharhapar and to codify its rules. Men like Misakian and Zorayian had already given examples of fairly polished prose. Zorayian had even invented political, economic, aesthetic, and commercial terms and tried to introduce some system similar to that of European languages.¹³ This socially conservative but linguistically liberal man had welcomed the seventeen-year old Krikor Odian's *Proposal for Regulating and Making Ashkharhapar the Popular Language* in his *Philologist* (1851). If Odian's proposal passed into history without unduly disturbing the kraparians (partisans of krapar), Ārusinian's did not. His *Orthology* (1853), composed according to logic but not according to the organic laws and traditions of the Armenian language, aroused not only the kraparians but some of the ashkharhapararians as well.¹⁴ The total failure of *Orthology* in spite of the efforts of Ārusinian, Odian, and Balian did not deter others from attempting to defend or to reform the vernacular. In 1874, appeared the first version of M. Cheraz's "Grammar of Eclectic Armenian" in his *Literary Essays* to be followed by a revised version in 1876. In this three-sheet manifesto, the author was advancing a more radical but a more modern Armenian than Ārusinian, but it met the same fate as its predecessor. However, Father Aydenians' monumental *Critical Grammar* (1866) was much more effective in advancing the cause of the popular language through its scholarly discussion of the origin, rise, and development of language with particular reference to ashkharhapar and through the formulation of more exact grammatical rules.¹⁵

One of the interesting aspects of the "Language Quarrel" was the fact that a man who used the vernacular as a neces-

154 *French Influence on Western Armenian Renaissance*
sary evil helped to assure its final triumph. Reminiscing forty years after he became manager and editor of *Masis*, Garabed Ū'ūjian wrote:

Whatever the condition of our modern language, permanent or unstable, it has been my purpose to purify it gradually of its popular coarseness and to bring it as close as possible to the language of our forefathers. The proof of that is not only in the progressive advancement of the language of *Masis* but also the palpable difference between the language of my first translations from that of the most recent ones. . . .

Yes, my dear friend, I have been an ashkharhaparian through necessity, but I have been a lover of the language of our ancestors from my childhood.⁶¹

While the quarrel raged on the pages of journals, the vernacular made real progress. Even the defenders of classical Armenian wrote in the popular language as they did battle with their adversaries although their literary productions remained in krapar. Here, as elsewhere, French played an important role. As the newly-founded journals sought to gain readers, they discovered that nothing was so avidly read as a novel. Unfortunately, until 1865 only four Armenian novels were written, which meant that the need had to be met through translation. This fitted well into the plans of the Renaissance Generation, one of the most important of whose goals was the acquaintance of Armenians with all phases of European culture. This generation of Francophile intellectuals turned logically in the direction of the literature they knew and admired so much.

Although progress was slow at first, it was still rapid compared to the situation which existed before 1850. In a study entitled "The Novel Among the Western Armenians" Ankeghya (A. Alboyajian) gives some very interesting statistics. He shows that from 1818 to 1850 inclusive there were only six novels, all of them translations. Four were translations from the French, including *Robinson Crusoe*! The language from which the other two were trans-

lated was unknown. Between 1851 and 1859, he lists twenty-four novels of which two were original, ten (or possibly eleven) were translations from French, three were translated from English, one from Italian, another from German, and there were seven whose language of translation was unknown. One of them could have been from English, but it cannot be assumed in view of the fact that *Robinson Crusoe* and the *Arabian Nights* were translated not from the language in which they were originally written but from French. Continuing the study of Ankeghya's compilation, we find twenty-two novels between 1860 and 1865 inclusive. Of these, twelve were from French, one from English, one from German, five whose language of translation was unknown, and three were original. In addition to these, there were nine translations into krapar, which included two versions each of *Télémaque* and *Paul et Virginie*. Seven of these were made in Venice, one in Paris, and one in Smyrna. There was none in Constantinople. Even when allowance is made for errors, the heavy preponderance of translations from French is eloquent testimony to its hegemony over Armenian intellectual life. Another bit of evidence is the fact that even in 1903, the date of this study, Gulliver in *Gulliver's Travels* is transliterated as Güliiver.¹⁷

The first great center of translation was Smyrna, where Mamurian and Chilingirian were holding forth as the two leading literary figures by offering the public translations of celebrated pieces of French literature almost as fast as the public could read them. Arp'iarian divides these translations into two groups represented by *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo* and *Les Misérables*. The aim and achievement of the first consisted of the inculcation of the love of reading and the refinement of taste through entertainment. The purpose of the second group was didactic. While Arp'iarian doubts that most readers were capable of grasping the full philosophical import of the book, he thinks that they were able to understand it sufficiently to profit from the experience.

Moreover, he affirms that the events that took place after 1860 can be better understood in the light of *Les Misérables*.¹⁸ Asadur agrees by saying:

It is not possible to deny that many young men of my generation were greatly influenced by reading Chilingirian's translation of *Les Misérables* and that the characters of Bishop Bienvenu, Jean Valjean, Fantine, Cosette, Javert, and Gavroche have left a deep impression on the minds of many.¹⁹

It is easy to understand why these characters should leave such a profound impression on the youth of Asadur's time. With a slight change in situation and milieu they could become identical with men and women they knew around them. Certainly, the ubiquitous priest was a familiar figure in Armenian life, and he was not always the type against whom the liberals were fighting. Jean Valjean need only change his name and be placed in Constantinople, and he would be just as severely persecuted as he had been in France, and for just as little, possibly even less. The pathetic situation of Fantine appealed easily to a people whose psychological state, induced by the concrete reality of centuries-long suffering, made them sympathetic toward the downtrodden. There was many a Gavroche, indeed, on the streets of Constantinople. Translated five years after it appeared in France,²⁰ *Les Misérables* achieved a success far beyond the fondest hopes of the translator.

Before Chilingirian stopped translating, he had given twenty-seven volumes of romantic novels to his readers, including *Manon Lescaut*, *Raphaël*, *Les Confessions d'un enfant du siècle*, and *Mathilde*.²¹ Perhaps the most prolific of all workers in this field was M. Mamurian, whose fifty-eight volumes included *Zadig*, *Micromégas*, *Jeannot et Colin*, *Le Barbier de Séville*, *Werther*, *Les Mystères de Paris*, *Les trois Mousquetaires* and its sequels, and *Le Tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*.²² Others contributed to a much lesser degree to swell this already impressive list. As

an interesting sidelight, it may be noted that Voltaire was the first author to be translated by Mamurian, who had been educated in the Mkhitarist School of Paris. Taking his cue from Smyrna, Ūt'ūjian translated nearly fifty volumes of literary works, the majority of which were French. Many others joined the procession. Few, indeed, were those young men who did not make their literary debut through the medium of translation. The journals became full of feuilletons in the European tradition.

The average reader enjoyed the novel in feuilleton form, but there was also the theatre-going public. Historical plays were produced by Armenian playwrights, but they could not write them fast enough for the eager public. Once again there had to be translations, and once again they were predominantly French. As the field widened still further through the rendition of poetry into Armenian, Corneille, Racine, Molière, La Fontaine, Lamartine, Musset, Vigny, and Hugo appeared with Fénelon, Sand, Dumas, Feuillet, Coppée, Malot, Boissodoy, Daudet, Maupassant, Zola, and others.²³ French scientists, philosophers, musicians, doctors, and psychologists joined the literary galaxy.

The abundance of translations seems to belie the difficulties which had to be overcome by these devoted translators. A whole new civilization was being expressed by a language which not only lacked the centuries-long evolution of literary French, but which also was geared to express an altogether different way of life. It lacked words and idioms. It lacked the refinement to express the delicate turns of the French language. It lacked a stabilized grammar. The translator had four alternatives: (1) to use old words and idioms with new meanings; (2) to use the French words which had no Armenian equivalents; (3) to use circumlocutions or explanations; (4) to create new words and expressions. All these devices were used in varying degrees, but the most frequently used was creation, often on the pattern set by the composition of a given French word. As every

translator tried to find or to create the "mot juste," thousands of new words and expressions came into existence. Lexicographers joined hands with the poets, critics, novelists, and essayists to enrich and to beautify the ashkharhapar. Men like Norayr Püzantat'si (1884), Mesrob Nubarian (1892), and Yeghya Demirjibashian (1896) each added more than two thousand words to the Armenian language in his French-Armenian dictionary. According to Demirjibashian, seven French-Armenian, Armenian-French dictionaries were published between 1871 and 1896, and an eighth was being printed at the time of his writing.²⁴ As against a few printed dictionaries, there were thousands of unprinted ones, as young students composed or compiled lists which they carried in their pockets.²⁵

To what extent the creation of new words was carried can be seen from the fact that Paul d'Arnout, who had studied Armenian at the Ecole des langues orientales vivantes, and later at Vienna, Tiflis, and Echmiadzin (a total of fourteen years), in accepting the invitation to contribute articles on the Armenian language to *Masis*, commented in his letter, "You use words which I cannot find in my dictionary."²⁶ The tendency has not yet stopped. Writers and journalists still coin words, but with less abandon and greater judiciousness.

However, this did not eliminate completely the use of French words in all kinds of literady efforts. Some authors did it sparingly. Others were more indiscriminate, justifying themselves on the grounds that they desired clarity, and that if the use of the French words helped them to express themselves precisely, they intended to use them. It is not unusual to find French phrases or whole sentences in the works of some of the later authors.

This phase of the linguistic movement had its advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, it made the language considerably richer. The large number of newly formed abstract and scientific words added greatly to its

vocabulary. It became possible to think and to talk effectively about modern political, religious, philosophical, literary, and scientific ideas. Freed of its impurities, and shaped by men who had absorbed the lessons of clarity and polish taught by Pascal and Boileau, the vernacular reached unexpected heights in suppleness and lucidity. Under the influence of French, it was elevated to the rank of a literary language.

On the negative side, it resulted in the excessive use of French words and expressions, in an extremely gallicized Armenian,²⁷ and in obscurity of meaning. The chaos which reigned in vocabulary and sentence structure as a result of almost anarchistic practices on the part of some authors at times confused the reader, and might have defeated the aim of the movement had the abuse been more widespread. Its effect was further mitigated by the fact that very few of the younger readers did not know French. As the linguistic exuberance subsided, many of the new creations fell into disuse and were replaced by others which were more in keeping with the spirit and traditions of the Armenian language. Others survived to become an integral part of contemporary Armenian. According to Ajařian, two hundred or more French words remained in the popular language of Constantinople, although very few of them found a permanent place in literary expression. A number of idioms which were literal translations of their French counterparts have also taken hold. In spite of the religious, political, and commercial penetration of Germans and Anglo Saxons, Ajařian finds their impact on the speech of the Armenians of Constantinople almost nil.²⁸ In view of these facts, it is safe to assume that the Armenian language would have been quite different today if it had not been for the direct and indirect influence of French.

In order to give a complete picture of the development of the vernacular, it is necessary to mention the role of the theatre. Speaking directly to the public, its language

had to be clear and understandable. Hence its use of a simple vernacular. The popularity of foreign masterpieces and Armenian historical plays for more than a quarter of a century enabled the theatre to exercise a salutary influence on the language and perhaps also on the artistic taste of the people.

It was partly this evolution and partly the transformation of sentiment resulting from the patriotic spirit engendered by the Renaissance Generation, the Constitutional movement, and the activity of the Armenian revolutionary parties that enabled Anaïs to say:

We no longer met Armenians who always spoke French or Turkish. They all made an effort to speak the mother tongue correctly. The *Grammar* of Mr. and Mrs. Asadur lay under the pillow of many. Embarrassed to admit it publicly, each one tried to learn secretly what he had unjustifiably considered superfluous. Young men who had already received a French education came to visit us once or twice a week and took Armenian lessons from me, requesting me to keep it secret.²⁹

REFERENCES

1. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 226-227.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 234-235. In the eighteenth century, Ajařian finds only ten books in ashkharhapar. If one counts various printings of some books, one arrives at the grand total of fourteen. *Ibid.*, p. 452.
3. It is interesting to note that according to F. Miklosich, *Die türkischen Elemente in den Südost- und Osteuropaischen Sprachen*, there were 2500 borrowings from Turkish in the Eastern and Southeastern European Languages. Cited by Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 270-272.
4. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 471.
5. Some of these communities were in Gesaria, Ayntab, Sis, Cyprus, Thrace, Bulgaria, Bessarabia, and Poland.
6. We find an echo of this in Zohrab's "Armenisa," *Voices of Conscience*, p. 153.
7. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 265.
8. It was primarily a grammar of the language spoken in his native Sepastia.

9. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 460
10. T'orosian, *op. cit.*, p. 261.
11. K. Fndk'lian, "The Progress of the Western Armenian Vernacular," *Masis*, Sept. 19, 1892, p. 194.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Chobanian, "Our Literature," *Orient*, April 18, 1892.
14. Odian, *op. cit.*, pp. XII-XV; Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 518.
15. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 505-506; Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.
16. Ut'ujian, "Ashkharhaparian or Kraparian," *Masis*, June 18, 1892, p. 130.
17. S. Ankeghya, "The Novel among the Western Armenians," *Flower*, Sept. 25, 1903, p. 375, and Oct. 2, 1903, p. 395.
18. A. Arp'iarian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, pp. 16-18, 63.
19. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 143.
20. *Les Misérables* was published in 1862.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
22. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 496-497.
23. Cf. also above, pp. 73-74.
24. Demirjibashian, "To the Reader," *French-Armenian Dictionary*, p. 1.
25. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, p. 472.
26. P. d'Arnout, *Masis*, March 15, 1908, p. 342. The spelling of this man's name represents a reconstruction from the Armenian. It may or may not be the exact rendition in French. He is not listed in the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Nationale*.
27. For a criticism of Russian-Armenian journalists who were responsible for the triumph of French style and idiom in their dailies and periodicals, see Zohrab, *A Vanished Generation*, p. 18.
28. Ajařian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 572-582.
29. Anařs, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-162.



The French Language in Armenian Schools

The modern Armenian "public" school dates only from 1790. Before then, neither Greeks nor Armenians in the Turkish Empire were permitted to have any institutions of learning other than seminaries. Those who wished to learn to read and to write had several alternatives. If they were well-to-do, they engaged a private tutor who more often than not was a clergyman. Those among the laymen who had acquired a large enough fund of knowledge to teach were called *badvelis*,¹ a term which was later applied to Protestant ministers. Those who were not well-to-do might acquire a little reading knowledge in the smithies, the shoe repair shops, the carpenters' shops, and tailors' shops. Occasionally, *badvelis* rented a little room at an inn where eager sons of artisans gathered reverently at the feet of these heavily titled men to familiarize themselves with the intricacies of the Armenian *krapar*. A few individuals established "schools" (in spite of official interdiction) where they taught either reading and writing or such special subjects as grammar and logic, but they were far from being "schools" or "public." The only institution in Constantinople which was worthy of being called a school was the seminary established by Patriarch Golod in 1715. In addition to the usual religious matter, its curriculum also included courses which were outside the religious field.²

It was after the accession of Selim III to the throne

(1789) that Mgrdich Amira Mirijanian conceived the idea of establishing parish schools to be financed by tuition and the church treasury. For this purpose, he obtained royal permission, after which the first parish school of modern times came into existence in 1790. It was appropriately called Lusavorchian Varzharan (School of the Illuminator) after the founder of the Armenian Church.³

Schools began to spring up in various quarters of the Capital, both in the Catholic parishes and the parishes of the Armenian Church. Other amiras followed the good example of Mgrdich by encouraging, supporting, and founding schools. In 1808, Fr. Mesrob wrote in his *Grammar* that everywhere people were given free education. Perhaps this is an exaggeration, but it is indicative of the extent of the effort made to educate children. The word "free" is also significant.⁴ Apparently, the system of tuitions had not yet been put into effect, perhaps because the majority of children attending school came from poor families. Such was, indeed, the case with the schools of Beyoghlu (suburb of Constantinople) where even for some time after the Armenian National Constitution it was not possible to institute the tuition system. The lay church officers and clergymen played the role of benefactors in order not to deprive the youngsters of an education.⁵ This was truly "public" education.

The Düzians gave considerable assistance to the Catholic Armenians, while Harut'yun Amira Bezjian (Kazaz Art'in) threw his support mostly toward the Armenian Church. In 1820, he founded a vocational school for girls at Kum-Kap'u and in 1826 another school at Pera where girls could learn embroidery. The year before, this practical, but kind and generous philanthropist, had rebuilt the cathedral and the adjoining school. The movement received new impetus when, through an encyclical issued on July 10, 1824, the Patriarch ordered the parishes to establish schools "for the education of the children of the church."

He even formed a short-lived educational council in 1828 consisting of clergymen and teachers. This was the ancestor of the Educational Council of 1853. More schools were born as more wealthy men joined the movement, among them Janig Amira P'ap'azian, who founded four schools and set aside permanent incomes for two others. Thus, by 1844, there were 44 Armenian schools in various parts of Constantinople, the most important of which was perhaps the Jemaran (academy) at Scutari (1838).

In summing up the progress made during the early years of the school movement, Alboyajian has very high praise for the Mkhit'arists, assisted by the Düzians, not only for the quality of the education given in their schools, but also for the role they played in bringing educational, artistic, and literary progress to the Armenians.⁶

As the schools grew, the need for a central organization became apparent, and in 1847, the Religious and Civil councils saw fit to put the direction in the hands of the Patriarchate. Before the Educational Council of 1853 was born, however, there were local educational councils whose task it was to oversee the program and maintenance of the parish schools.⁷ Finally, the first Educational Council was appointed in 1853 with a three-fold purpose: (1) to put order into the plan of the national schools, (2) to furnish adequate textbooks, and (3) to select and supervise teachers. Analysis of this body shows that at least eight of its members had studied in Europe, most of them in France. Such familiar names as Üt'üjjan, Balian, Bardizbanian, Rûsinian, Servichen, and three Dadians comprised most of the membership of the Council. Dissolved two years later because of the dispute over Rûsinian's *Orthology*, it was not reactivated until 1860.⁸

It is significant that there is a net loss of fourteen schools between 1844 and 1863, the year in which the Armenian National Constitution was finally approved by the Turkish

government, in spite of the fact that the prestige of education was growing due to the success of European-educated young men in business. The greatest decline was from 1859 (42) to 1863 (30).⁹ This was due to a variety of causes. In some places, the church was not in a strong enough position to support the school, especially where the tuition-free students were many. There was a lack of well-prepared teachers. The sons and daughters of many of the rich had private tutors or attended foreign or Armenian Catholic institutions. The religious quarrels and the disputes of the amiras with the esnafs¹⁰ over the National Administration were other reasons. The lack of effective central direction and the periodic fires which razed parts of the Capital were still others.

From 1863 on, the growth was more steady. The success of the educated in commerce finally increased the prestige of education to the point where the educated were able to persuade the skeptics and the inert that schooling was essential. They succeeded so well that those who lacked education pretended to have it. New schools were built and old ones reopened.¹¹ Local educational associations, formed in the middle of the century, served as examples for the more ambitious organizations which came into being in the 60's and 70's. It was not sufficient to have schools in Constantinople. It was necessary to meet the educational needs of the provinces, too, by founding schools, by maintaining them, by furnishing books, and by encouraging people to learn. Thus, the Humanitarian, Charitable, Asian, Araratian, Educational, Oriental, and Cilician¹² among the more than a score of associations vied with one another in activeness and generosity.¹³ By 1902, according to the statistics published by the Patriarchate, there were 803 schools throughout the Armenian provinces and the other parts of the Ottoman Empire, attended by 59,513 boys and 21,713 girls and staffed by 2,088 teachers.¹⁴ Among the best Armenian

schools might be mentioned Sanasarian of Garin, Getronagan and Berberian of Constantinople, the Normal School of Van, and Mesrobian of Smyrna.

It would be a mistake to think that educational work was confined to youngsters of school age. In the 70's, by direction from the Educational Council and through the cooperation of the educational associations, the community embarked upon a program of adult education which included the opening of evening and Sunday schools. Plain laborers, after a hard day's work went to spend their evenings reciting their a, b, c's under the direction of men who were perhaps young enough to be their sons or grandsons.¹⁵

In the progress of the Armenian educational movement, the Protestant schools had a share, too, by stimulating competition, by providing examples of relatively well-furnished schoolrooms, and by educating a segment of the population. In time, American missionaries established not only lower schools but also colleges in Constantinople (2), Kharpert, Ayn'tab, and Marzvan and rendered important service in the enlightenment of the Armenian public. The English, although fewer in number, were not absent from the scene. By 1846, the impact of Protestant activity in and out of the classroom was great enough to cause the Patriarchate to feel the necessity of increasing the number of parish schools as the best means of combating Protestantism.

Well-managed and well-equipped schools were not the exclusive property of the Protestants. The Catholic missionaries had maintained well-organized and efficiently administered schools in Constantinople for centuries. The Armenian Catholics joined them in the nineteenth century. Besides, the men who gave the greatest impetus to education had studied in France and in other European countries, where they had seen good schools in operation. Once again, the Mkhitarists exerted a beneficial influence on the cultural development of the nation by educating young Armenians in the Muradian and Haygazian schools, estab-

lished in Paris and patterned after European institutions of learning.¹⁶

In the new school, where the teaching of reading was concerned, the program of studies did not differ from that of the "schools" of the eighteenth century. Gregory of Nareg, the Psalter, and the book of Acts constituted the reading matter as late as 1858, possibly even later. The program became somewhat richer at the upper level of elementary education, and as the reigns of Mahmud II and Abdul-Mejid progressed, French slowly found its way into the curriculum. By 1844, Alboyajian estimates that between ten and twenty of the forty-four schools in existence offered French or Italian.¹⁷ It does not seem illogical to assume that Italian was offered mostly in Mkhit'arist schools inasmuch as the commercial importance of Italy had gradually diminished. On the other hand, the political and cultural importance of France in the Ottoman Empire had been growing steadily since the eighteenth century. Educated people, who belonged to the clergy or the economically fortunate class, learned one of these languages but tended to favor French more and more in keeping with the trend of the time. If the schools failed to meet their needs, there were always private tutors. According to Asadur, the mother of Srpuhi Düsap, the novelist, born in the first quarter of the century, was taught to speak French and Greek quite early in her youth.¹⁸ Even those who were not well-to-do, but who thirsted for knowledge, learned it by their own efforts, as did Deroyent's Badveli. This self-educated man learned French well enough to translate Pascal's *Pensées*. In 1838, the opening announcement of the academy at Scutari included French grammar, composition, conversation, and penmanship in the curriculum. The reasoning was that the person who had mastered a foreign language could improve himself by reading about his business and profession, and he could gain a foreign clientele.¹⁹ In 1842, Krikor Aghat'on wrote to his brother from Paris:

No matter what science you study, you cannot do without mathematics. Therefore, please begin to learn French mathematics, both theoretical and practical, with algebra and especially geometry.²⁰

The need was great in the purely educational field, too, independent of practical considerations. The growing network of Armenian schools throughout the empire, the increase of the school population, and the enrichment of the program of studies necessitated some kind of plan. A slow evolutionary process of trial and error was unsatisfactory in view of the rapidity of progress outside Turkey. If Armenian schools were going to help the nation to modernize itself along the pattern of European nations, within a reasonably short time, they could not afford slow experimentation. They had to find materials and organizations which they could adapt successfully to their needs. Given the general atmosphere of the time, it was natural to turn to France. To know her language and literature was to be civilized. To use her educational organization was to insure the attainment of that goal. French spread rapidly throughout the schools long before a centralized educational program existed. In a school like the Naregian of Beyoghlu, an upper elementary school where the overwhelming majority of students came from poor families, French was compulsory in the fourth and fifth grades by 1858.²¹ Krikor Zohrab attests to the popularity of French in 1870 in his reminiscences about his life at T'arkmanchat's (Translators' school) by saying:

Father Arsen translated Racine's tragedy, T'erzian Father Arsen's *Iphiginia*, Taghlian T'erzian's *Santukhd*, and all of us Michel Lévy's famous anthology *Théâtres contemporains*, a real school of translators.²²

In a directive to the parish schools in 1886, the National Administration prescribed a program which included the introduction of French or²³ English at the first level (i.e.,

grades 1-4) and the teaching of French or English at the second level (i.e., grades 5-10).²⁴

In the programs of all the private institutions which announced every August their September opening dates, French was listed as a required subject at a very early stage. In 1885 an Armenian school was even granting the degree of Baccalauréat ès sciences [et] ès lettres.²⁵ On the other hand, at the Mirijanian School of Languages, not only was the French language taught as such, but it was used in the teaching of sciences.²⁶ Needless to say, such a pretentious program required native French teachers, and the school made it a point to call it to the attention of the public in its releases. It further announced that there was to be a resident French and, if need be, an English governess at the school.²⁷ As late as 1906, years after agitation against French and in favor of English had begun, the P'alakashian School for Girls was announcing the teaching of French conversation from kindergarten through the senior year (of an eleven-year course). In italics, it stressed the fact that special attention was given to the study of French throughout the school program.²⁸ The Berberian School, founded in 1876 by R. Berberian was, naturally enough, another stronghold of French. Even Protestant schools operated by Anglo-American missionaries offered French as one of the foreign languages.

French had been taught in Smyrna for a long time, possibly even before it was taught in Constantinople. In 1865, Sdep'an Vosgan, as director of the Mesrobian School, put the teaching of French and ashkharhapar on solid grounds. Somewhat later, in Garin, the Sanasarian (established in 1881) and other schools were exposing their youngsters to the intricacies and beauties of the French language and literature. Other parts of the provinces followed as the number of schools multiplied rapidly. Even villages which had hitherto been without schools began to enjoy the luxuries of one, and some of them offered French

in their program. Will the reader be surprised to learn that French took its place beside Persian and Russian in Persian-Armenian schools?

In 1891, a new program, drawn up by a committee under the chairmanship of R. Berberian, became the educational law for the Armenian schools of Constantinople and the provinces. Foreign languages, except Turkish, were eliminated from the lower elementary school, and only French was required in the upper level. Thus, English, which had been there for the most part only in print, disappeared from the records as well.²⁹

The educational machinery was far from perfect. Teachers in a rather rapidly growing system were not always well prepared. Buildings often left a great deal to be desired. Outmoded disciplinary measures added to the problem, as did the discrepancy between the educational products and the needs of a given community. Proponents of a practical education were joined in their criticism of the Armenian system by those who felt that the most useful type of education for the Armenian people, especially in the provinces, was that which made them better farmers and artisans. Criticism came from all directions and at all times. Arp'ian sums it up by writing:

The educational direction of the provinces was given by Constantinople, and it is natural that that direction should be wrong. . . .

The education given to the provinces by Constantinople really consisted of nothing but sending the educational programs, the textbooks, and the teachers of Constantinople. . . . An education which was diametrically opposed to local dialects and to local needs began to disturb the manners and morals, heart and mind of the provincials.³⁰

He goes on to say that reform is needed. Revealing that in Garin, French was removed from the program of girls' schools, he expresses his hope that it will be eliminated from

the boys' schools, too. He believes that provincials are ill-suited to the intricacies of the French language, as evidenced by their mediocre success during the past thirty years. In the Sanasarian School, where both French and German are taught, students have shown far greater success in the latter because, in his opinion, the structure and sounds of the German language are closer to that of Armenian. Up to this point, the prevailing opinion had been that French was necessary for commerce, but Arp'irian does not share the view. Literature has its disadvantages, too. The beauty and levity of French literature affect the character of our provincial people. He mentions especially Zola's novels as harmful to youthful readers, not because they are bad in themselves, but because the readers have not been trained to read them with the proper perspective and understanding. If it is necessary to teach a European language to some of our provincial elements in order to achieve progress, let us teach German or English. Arp'irian is far from disliking French. In fact, he had been brought up on French and had learned a great deal from this language and literature. He simply felt that provincial youth lacked the necessary maturity and training to appreciate and profit from their contact with French literature.

Krikor Zohrab, who had shown remarkable self-restraint, jumped into the arena to answer those who advocated a practical education. Warming up to his subject by declaring that schools could not prepare secretaries for merchants indefinitely because they would soon saturate a market which was becoming more and more restricted due to foreign competition, he stated:

No, boys do not go to school in order to learn how to earn money. No, that venal spirit will not guide Armenian children. The child will go there first of all to learn what man and citizens ought to know. . . .

Education is sought for the sake of moral and intellectual advancement and not for making money.

We must not confuse education with a trade. One can serve the other, but the goals will always remain different.³¹

He further states that he believes in teaching practical skills, but only after youth has gained a knowledge of himself and of human morality. Just now, our nation is in need of education in order to climb the ladder of civilization. Therefore, individual needs and rights must give way to the interests of the nation. Girls will help their nation, not by earning the greatest amount of money, but by achieving the greatest degree of intellectual progress.

Zohrab was far from being unaware of the shortcomings of this program and some of the pitfalls which lay in the westward orientation of his people. In 1884, he had criticized roundly in his first and only novel, *A Vanished Generation*, the abysmal ignorance of things Armenian shown by boys and girls who attended foreign schools. In the following passage, he is describing the graduates of a French boarding school for girls:

French history, French geography, French literature, and the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church are what this girl, who had been alienated early from her people, enumerated to her astonished friend. Even a French young lady would have envied this Oriental French girl. Every little stream, mountain, and valley, the most obscure hamlet were known to this Armenian girl, who was ignorant of, and did not wish to know, about her native Ararat.³²

After criticizing this alienation, Zohrab goes on to show how his heroine through association with an educated young man, and through the reading of European authors, becomes well educated.³³ In other words, he is nationalistic in his attitude, but he wishes to use the knowledge and experience of Europeans as a means of improving the cultural level of his people.

In less than two years, Zohrab's opinions underwent a change. The new educational program had, apparently,

made him reflect further on the thorny problem, so that he expressed an altogether different view in *Masis* on September 19, 1892.³⁴ After pointing out that the new program was exactly like the European programs (others had said it was the duplicate or imitation of the French), he criticized severely the uniform plan for such widely different places as Constantinople and Van. He felt that elementary education in each locality should be designed to meet the local needs. For instance, he would make French compulsory for students in seaports and commercial centers, but he would spare the students in the mountains of interior Armenia, where he would lay the emphasis on the practical arts. This educational relativism would extend even to instruction in morals.

It was as a result of all these criticisms that vocational schools were established, and German and English came to compete with French. Yet, it must be admitted that the competition was very unequal. The same complaints were being made against the intrenchment of French in Armenian schools in 1897 and 1907.

REFERENCES

1. That is the reason Derozent's was called badveli.
2. Alboyajian, "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium*, Oct. 24, 1903.
3. *Ibid.* For public schools in the early days of the Armenian Church, see p. 51, n. 9, above.
4. Alboyajian, "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium*, Oct. 24, 1903.
5. T. Azadian, *History of the Esayan School*, p. 15.
6. Alboyajian, "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium* Oct. 24, 1903.
7. *Ibid.*, Oct. 25, 1903.
8. *Ibid.*, Oct. 27, 28, 1903.
9. *Ibid.*, Oct. 24, 28, 1903.
10. The artisans and small businessmen.
11. Alboyajian, "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium*, Dec. 18, 1903.

12. The last three combined in the 80's into the United Association.
13. Alboyajian, *Krikor Zohrab*, pp. 192-193; Varantian, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 262, 267.
14. M. Léart, *La Question arménienne à la lumière des documents*, pp. 68-69.
15. Azadian, *op. cit.*, p. 20; P'astermajian, *op. cit.*, p. 304.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 12; P'astermajian *op. cit.*, p. 302; N. K., "The Condition of the Armenian Schools in Turkey," *Orient*, Dec. 29, 1889.
17. Alboyajian, "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium*, Oct. 24, 1904.
18. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 160.
19. "Announcement of the Academy," in K'ochian, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.
20. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., pp. 46-47, n.
21. Azadian, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
22. K. Zohrab, *Well known Figures and Short Stories*, p. 148.
23. The "or English" does not seem to have meant very much if we are to believe all the criticisms of the French monopoly in the foreign language field in Armenian schools, long after the directive was issued.
24. "Directive for the Reorganization of the Parish Schools of Constantinople," *Orient*, Dec. 2, 1886.
25. "A Few Words Concerning the New Organization of the Aramian School," *Orient*, Sept. 12, 1885. In criticizing the terminology used by Aramian for the designation of grades, the author points out that the grades in the French lycée are designated by 8-1 in descending order. In other words, things French have become the criteria by which their Armenian counterparts are judged.
26. That was true also of the Melkonian Institute of Cyprus. However, recently English has supplanted French.
27. Demirjibashian, "The Mirijanian School of Languages," *The Globe*, No. 6, 1888, pp. 333-334. The author commends the practicability of the whole program.
28. "The P'alakashian School for Girls," *Flower*, July 6, 1906, pp. 1096-1097.
29. It is also interesting to note that the program prescribed a "Froebelian system" of teaching in kindergarten.
30. A. Arp'arian, "A National Outlook," *Massis*, Sept. 15, 1890, p. 17.
31. Zohrab, "Education at the end of the Century," *Orient*, Dec. 11, 1890.
32. Zohrab, *A Vanished Generation*, pp. 16-17.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-19.
34. Zohrab, "The Teachers' Conference," *Massis*, Sept. 17, 1892, p. 189.



CHAPTER VII

The French Penetration into Armenian Life

The love of France and things French so characteristic of the Renaissance Generation grew steadily with the years. There was an uninterrupted flow of students from Constantinople to Paris.

The greatest vanity of the Armenian aristocracy consisted of sending their sons to Parisian schools, while the middle class, unable to reach that source of enlightenment through their own efforts, waited anxiously for a new benefactor to appear or for fortune to smile so that they might send their sons to the City of Light as quickly as possible. . . . It was from France that we received our scholars and scientists.¹

Medicine, law, engineering, and agriculture were the favorite fields in the eighties and nineties just as they had been in the forties and fifties. The journalistic literature sometimes speaks with pride and at other times with concern about the boys who receive their education in Paris. The pride results from their success in the academic field and their contribution to the welfare of their people. The concern arises from the indifference of those who, having completed their studies, either choose to stay in Paris or, upon their return, become so engrossed in earning money and enjoying themselves that they are of no service to the nation. The depth of the grief of the leaders of the Arme-

nian nation can be imagined when it is recalled that men, institutions, movements, the press, and literature were judged by their usefulness to the people. To them a man who merely practiced his profession was not useful to his people. Consequently, he was lost as far as the Armenians were concerned, and given the dire need for leadership and useful individuals, they could not afford the loss of even one person.

Lost was also another group of persons. That group consisted of those who, in Zohrab's words:

know neither their language well nor the language of our country [Turkey].

There is a whole generation of estranged Armenians in Smyrna. I have seen them. They have not wished to remain Armenian, and they have not succeeded in becoming French.²

The heroic efforts of the intellectuals and patriots to purify the language and to encourage everyone to speak it had achieved considerable success by 1893 through the medium of schools, newspapers, the theatre, and public functions where Armenian was spoken. Nevertheless, it had not been able to eradicate Turkish and French from the vocabulary of some of the older people. Anaïs relates that Art'in P'asha Dadian, a graduate of Sainte-Barbe of Paris and an adviser to the Turkish Foreign Office, spoke an Armenian liberally sprinkled with Turkish words, but she also indicates that he spoke good French with no trace of accent.³ There were many like Art'in P'asha in Constantinople, but there were also those among the younger generation who, undoubtedly, became snobs after the acquisition of some knowledge of the French language and literature and wished to show their superiority over their compatriots through the exclusive use of that language. There must have been still others who, while they remained faithful to their national traditions, considered a knowledge of French an essential attribute of a cultured mind.⁴ This was not a new phenomenon.

At the turn of the century, the Russians had passed through the same stage according to Tolstoi, who, in describing Prince Vasili, states: "He spoke that elegant French in which Russians formerly not only talked but also thought."⁵ Later, he comments further on the language of his prince by saying: "He spoke in French and like a Frenchman accented the last syllable of Kutuzof's name."⁶

All this implies the existence of ample opportunity to acquire the skill to read and to speak the French language. Again turning to Anaïs, one finds that Krikor Odian was not the only one who had been fortunate enough to have a French tutor, for her father, uncle, and aunt had also had one. With the popularity of the French language, increased the popularity of the French tutor or governess. Learning the language of civilization via the "pratique" under the guidance of a tutor became the rage and a status symbol. The conventional method used in school was scorned by nearly everyone. The "pratique," the practical, conversational method was the last word in language teaching. Even after 1900, parents whose daughters were learning French via the "pratique" were proud of the fact.⁷ In fact, "In wealthy Armenian family circles, a French teacher had as much prestige as the lady of the house."⁸ The French private school was the ally of the tutor and the governess in spreading the French civilization in the Near East. In the eighties, still in her early adolescence, Anaïs was sent to one of these private schools owned and managed by a certain Mme Fure, whose daughter, interestingly enough, spoke Armenian fluently.⁹ When one adds to all this the work of the Armenian and French Catholic, as well as the national schools, one sees the tremendous impact of French culture on the Armenian people.

The importance of the French language, the love of Romantic literature transmitted to their contemporaries and successors by the Renaissance Generation, and the added attention paid to girls' education almost drove some of the

latter out of their senses. The following satire by Yeghia Demirjibashian may be symptomatic of the psychological state of these girls:

Today we read Lamartine with my uncle. Have you noticed what harmony there is in the name of the poet who was the apostle of harmony? What feminine, what spiritual, what ideal element there is in the name Lamartine! I repeat that name often to myself. I repeat it fifty, a hundred times, and it seems to me that I am playing the most harmonious music. Was it not sufficient to be called Lamartine in order to become immortal? ¹⁰

Obviously, what Demirjibashian describes here is a real mental and emotional state in spite of its apparent exaggeration. Many were the girls who harbored romantic thoughts in their bosoms. Many were the hours they spent in imaginary flights into the world of loving, suffering, and poetic beings. For them, they were not dreams. They were real experiences. Anaïs, who furnishes some very valuable and interesting information in her *Memoirs* concerning the life of this period, describes her own youthful dreams at her family seashore resort in the following terms:

It [the romantic little spot behind the house washed by advancing and receding waves] had awakened my being. The sky, the light, the sea, life disturbed me. All the idylls, all the stories of love lived in my soul. For hours I recalled the beings whose shadows surrounded me. Especially on nights when the moon shone bright, I used to see the hapless romantic lover, Werther, who in his dark blue frock coat, wide-brimmed hat, [and] yellow cloak went to knock on the door of the mayor's residence. Then the singer of Lake Bourget, the mournful soul, the noble poet, with his black tie, 'O lac! l'année à peine a fini sa carrière, / Et près des flots chéris qu'elle devait revoir, / Regarde! je viens seul m'asseoir. . . .' The immortal lamentation of Lamartine.¹¹

The spirits of Werther and Lamartine were joined by those of the tragic Bedros Turian and the Musset of the "Nuit de

décembre." Demirjibashian, who parodies the naive admiration of young Armenian girls, was himself partly responsible for the existence of this "état d'âme," not only through his writings, but also through his actions, for Anaïs reveals that he had just sent her a copy of Musset's *Poésie nouvelle*.¹²

It seems that Romantic literature was not the only thing that occupied the minds of many a young lady. The more "emancipated" among them had become interested in more prosaic things, at least during the moments when they were free of emotional intoxication. In his series, Demirjibashian amuses himself at the expense of the girls who had become interested in politics, history, economics, and other subjects which had hitherto been considered to be the monopoly of men.

What seemed innocuous and amusing to a Demirjibashian in 1887, had a more serious side which became a cause for alarm in the minds of others. Again, it is Arp'iarian who speaks out:

Zola's books have become too popular among us, especially among girls. Every father whose daughter knows French can find a *Nana* or a *Bête humaine* under the pillow of his chaste daughter. . . . The imagination of our girls is disturbed by Nana's picture.

Is it necessary to say more? There are very sad realities which cannot be written down, but I know how fatal French novels, especially works like *Nana*, have been to our girls, and even to some of our boys.¹³

This is not a lone voice in the desert. The problem had been aired as early as 1884 by Püzant K'echian in *Masis*. In his "Social Problems," as causes for the increase of divorces and family law suits, he had mentioned marriages made by parents and the weakening of the religious feeling. However, side by side with these, and even more important than they, he had mentioned the sudden, widespread contact with western civilization without proper education. The evil

spread to the provinces by those who went to Constantinople for a short period in order to improve their financial status.¹⁴

This moral problem was not confined to the Armenians. Contemporary French newspapers were also concerned with "immoral" literature and its effect on the population. However, the problem was magnified in the eyes of a people who prided themselves on their puritanical moral code, the sanctity of their homes, and the high moral standards of young and old in spite of a state of servitude under the polygamous and aggressive Turk. When cries of immorality arose, some defenders of Armenian tradition were quick to raise their voices in defense of the moral standards of the rank and file of the Armenian nation while blaming the relatively few aberrations on European contacts.

The unrelenting wave of criticism, and its suggested remedy, turning to the literature of the North, apparently had some effect, so that in 1892, Diran K'elegian could feel justified in maintaining that an improvement had taken place in the manners and customs of the people.¹⁵ In 1897, Ahrsam was saying the same thing concerning Smyrna.¹⁶ However, while K'elegian attributed the change to the fact that young people had become mature enough to read Zola without the weakening of their moral fiber, Ahrsam attributed it to the reaction caused by the salutary influence of German and Anglo-American manners and literature.

We do not question the existence of a reaction in Smyrna by 1897, but it seems difficult to accept completely the author's evaluation of the contemporary picture, for even after 1900, there are echoes of the deep-rooted French influence in Smyrna, itself. As for Constantinople, the French element was far from disappearing from Armenian literature and manners. Only it was no longer transmitted exclusively through Armenian and French schools or by Armenian students returning from Paris, although their numbers had by no means diminished.

A large colony of Europeans, including a substantial number of French, had gradually established itself on the shores of the Bosphorus, with Pera and Kadēk'eoy as its principal centers. If Mik'ael Shamdanjian is correct, by 1899, the Europeans had achieved supremacy in the business world by owning or controlling the financial firms, railroads, street car and gas companies, and water works.¹⁷ The extent to which this is true can be seen from an examination of the advertisements in *Orient*, *Masis*, and other publications. The insurance and shipping companies show English, American, German, or French ownership. Machinery companies seem to be German or Armerican, while medical products appear to be primarily French. Department stores, too, have a tendency to be French. In the same issue, one may see an advertisement of the local firm "Au Pont Neuf" with one of "Grands magasins du Printemps," or "Au bon marché," or some other department store of Paris. An advertisement of "Crédit Foncier de France" in one issue may be replaced by one of "Huile de Hogg,"¹⁸ "La Valoutine," or "Diaphane"¹⁹ in another. Even local or foreign firms owned by non-French persons sometimes bear a French name. "La New-York"²⁰ and "Au Panthéon" are cases in point. If the owners, themselves, fail to conform to such practices, the Armenian who transliterates the names sometimes sees to it that they receive a French flavor.²¹

Between 1840 and 1892, fourteen hotels were built in Pera, ranging in size from twenty to forty-two rooms and almost all bearing such names as Hotel du Luxembourg, Hotel de France, Hotel de Byzance, Hotel des Colonies, and Hotel d'Angleterre. Plans were being made for the construction of a new one, with 150 rooms and the most modern conveniences.²² In the same year, an Armenian bookstore was advertising eleven different French periodicals, which included *Journal pour tous*, *Echo de la semaine*, *Annales Littéraires*, *Monde-illustré*, *Figaro-illustré*, *Figaro-*

musical, *Revue Encyclopédique*, besides a number of others.²³ As further evidence of this French penetration, one might mention the New French Theatre at Pera, where the theatre-goer might see French plays ranging from works of Scribe to *L'Avare* and *La Dame aux camélias*, with Sarah Bernhardt in the title role. Operas might run the gamut from *Carmen* and *Romeo et Juliette* to *La Fille du Tambour major*.²⁴

The increasing diplomatic and commercial activity in Turkey after 1870 is a matter of history. It is also a matter of history that Bismarck's interest in Turkey was not at first very keen, for he was primarily concerned with isolating France on the continent. It was after 1888 that an intensified effort was made to achieve political and commercial control of the European and Levantine portion of the Ottoman Empire. It is further true that every mile of the railways in Asiatic Turkey was owned by the French or the British.²⁵ The ten-year period between 1888 and 1898 was a period of feverish activity in Turkey by German businessmen. In spite of the tremendous progress in railway construction, the French were still in the fore, with Germany a close second and Britain a very poor third. In 1899, the chairman of the Ottoman Public Debt Administration was a Frenchman. The Ottoman Bank was controlled by French financiers. The French-owned railway which began at the French-developed port of Smyrna still gave access of trade routes to all parts of Asia Minor to the French. In 1903, the French investments in Turkey exceeded two and one-half billion francs. Three-fifths of the public debt of the Imperial Ottoman Treasury (one and one-half billion francs) was owed to France.²⁶ Besides, French religious and cultural activity dated back several centuries. While a surging German Empire posed some threats in this field, it could not dislodge the French from the cultural field in a short time, especially since the French took up the challenge by expanding their own activity. As a result, the French still

represented the foremost cultural force in the Turkish Empire.²⁷ If, in addition, one considers the fact that those Western Armenians who knew German by virtue of study in Germany were very few, indeed, one can see that the German influence could not be great. It seems logical, under the circumstances, to conclude that, if there was any change in manners, it resulted from the persistent attack on shortcomings by the press and the increasing education and maturity of young people.

There was another, although less serious, aspect to the problem created by the reading of novels. One of the principal aims of the founders of the Renaissance movement was to inculcate the reading habit in the public, but they could scarcely have foreseen the situation described by Mano in the following passage:

Teachers sow the seeds of a theoretical education in young minds, and when a young man or young woman comes out of school and feels himself free, he begins to swim in novels.²⁸ He hardly knows how to read and, behold, he sacrifices his whole day to the reading of novels.

The novel . . . that is the malady of the youth of the end of the century. . . . The Armenian girl, we must confess, does not know how to manage a home.²⁹

This sounds like the centuries-old complaint about the deterioration of the manners of the young. Undoubtedly, the authors met some young Armenian girls who preferred reading to cooking and cleaning house, but it is open to question whether they would not have preferred something else in the absence of novels, and as long as they were given the novel, they simply decided to make use of it. It is also quite possible that novels distracted some serious girls who would otherwise have attended to their traditional duties.

In 1897, the semi-monthly *Light* was stating that its aim was to occupy its proper "place in the moral world" by

being the "organ of traditional literature and traditionally clean morals."³⁰ Its pages were filled with serious analyses or good-natured satires of contemporary manners, especially of those features which were considered to be of foreign origin. In the pages of *Light*, the reader finds the negative, but often the comical, side of manners. There one finds echoes of the feminist dispute aroused years ago by Düsap's *Mayda* and the influence of "décolleté" literature on morals. One sees especially the salon life of the period, one day in all its banality and lack of taste, the next with all its luster, dignity, and delicacy. One day it is a provincial who is telling about the shortcomings of his neighbors. Another it is a resident of the Capital who is laughing at the expense of his compatriots. At one time, Srpuhi Gülüzian writes the following lines:

The local young girls and ladies are extreme lovers of new fashions, which they design themselves instead of copying from foreigners. . . . Is this not a commendable quality?

The desire to wear hats has not yet become general. It is only the novices who rushed from Ashkhenian to the Jesuit school who wear hats. . . .

Outside or in the salons their [girls'] speech and behavior is modest and virtuous,³¹ but at home, . . . 'Oh, I am trembling, I am so pale.'³²

These girls sulk two weeks for two yards of ribbon. When they walk along the streets, they lift up their very long skirts almost to the knees in order to show their fine petticoats.

At another time, a Lila draws the portrait of a type of girl who graces the salons. According to him, she is twenty-three to twenty-five years old, pale, and sleepless in appearance, whose handbag is full of money, who goes shopping alone (!), and who is not supposed to be criticized.

The book she reads is a novel,³³ and the piece she plays on the piano is *Norma*. . . .

She does not look at herself in her negligee, because she simply hates that *laissez-aller* condition. When she wakes up in the morning and lifts her head from her feather pillows, her first preoccupation is her *fil d'Ecosse* stockings and her *à la princesse jarrettières*. Then comes her mask of Venus, the powder, her curls, dental powder, corset, *cire (s)*, *escarpins*, *jupe* and *blouse*, and thus she descends to the salon to have breakfast in the *toilette* with which a modest girl would give luster to any *soirée*.³⁴

This girl does not wish to marry, because she has all the material things she wants, and for a people like the Armenians among whom the family occupies such an important place, that is almost tantamount to a tragedy.

Sdep'an Vosgan, also somewhat disturbed by the changes which seemed to be taking place in Armenian manners, addressed Armenian women thus:

Armenian families, don't exchange gold for lead. Don't consider European external beauty as a sign of refinement, and don't abandon for a piece of cloth the modesty which at one time had given you spiritual beauty. Armenian women, begin by adopting the heart, the mind, and the lofty and clean sentiments of noble European women before constricting your bodies and circulating your blood in crinoline. Remember that if men have the duty to perform noble deeds, it is the women who have to inspire in them the idea for these deeds. Do not forget that morals are in the hands of women and that they make them what they want them to be.³⁵

The French language followed French manners as they seeped through each successive layer of society. Today, after two or three months' residence in a country, some consider themselves expert enough to write "profound" analyses of their whole social, political, and cultural life. In the nineteenth century, some young men considered themselves completely Europeanized and superior to their countrymen after a few months' residence in the City of Light. They showed it not only in their attitudes and manners, but also

in their speech, and undoubtedly they were joined in this by the young men who had just completed or were completing a few years of elementary and secondary school French. They set out with their youthful exuberance and self-confidence to make inroads into their mother tongue. The following excerpts from an amusing satire on the subject gives an idea of the extent to which this may have been true:

Ah, Sapristi! What a time I had catching the boat. *Nom de dieu, de nom de dieu!* I am all *transpiré*: *Quelle jolie course!* Good heavens. There was a man in front of me who refused to get out of the way. *En voilà un nigaud.* I pushed him aside with one blow of the *talon*. Didn't he see that I intended to take the boat for the island? If I had lost this boat, I would have been *manqué* to my word, and I would have lost the *occasion* to *croiser* Miss Dzidzaghian in my *tante's* salon.

This young man meets an acquaintance on the boat and insists upon telling his European experience in this manner:

In Europe, they don't stop at looking at one another. It is necessary to have lived there in order to know these things. There, people become friends immediately. In the hotel where I lived—but you don't know the hotels there—I met a *comtesse*. Soon we came to know each other. We were together day and night! We used to go to the *Théâtre français* and the *Opéra-Comique*. What beautiful *marbre* stairs. Oh, no, it is not the kind of theatre you know. You have not even dreamed of it here. And what *représentations*. And the Bois de Boulogne, where we went to *patiner* with Mrs. Deschanell I was just the way you see me now, *du chic*, every day *ganté, guêtré, claqué, fraqué*. Eh, *bien! Au revoir*.

This gallant, in spite of his air of importance, apparently fails to attract the attention of the ladies, for he continues:

But how strange are the women here. They look at you slowly, without making a sign. It seems that they don't know what is going on in the world. They look as if they have not seen anything. Ah! *c'est épatant*. They look at you indifferently, *la bouche béante*. They don't know anyone outside their gold-

smith husbands, *il paraît*. Open your eyes, ladies, there are also *boulevardiers et des flirts* in this world.

These two must be *françaises* and *actrices*. With what a bad *accent* they speak their language. *Tant pis*, they have come here, and they have lost their *prononciation*. After all, it is different to have lived in Europe. Scarcely six months ago I hardly knew a word of French, but on my return I had learned it so well that in the *messagerie* everyone thought I was *originaire de Paris*. *C'était à ébahir! C'était un vrai miracle*. I did not disillusion them. They wanted a *carte*. *Par bonheur*, I had just had it *lithographié* at the B. Arnaud & Cie. in Paris, reforming my name completely—Yeghia Ghazarosian—Elie Lazare!!!³⁶

This was *Les Précieuses ridicules* all over again, and, although there was no Molière to take advantage of it, time and ridicule helped to put an end to its excesses.

It must be said that there was a much more serious and constructive side to this picture. The young men returning from Paris were already meeting (1849) at the house of Mgrdich Amira Jezzaïlian in order to exchange views on national problems. These were intellectual soirées, perhaps different from the average salon, and possibly minus the frills characteristic of later such gatherings. A little later, the soirées at the Balian residence, where Rusinian always occupied the place of honor, were even more brilliant according to Asadur, who says:

The literary gatherings and dinners at the seashore residence [of Hagop Balian] in Ort'akügh were a real novelty in our manners at that time. There, many literary problems came up and were solved. They thought of means of improving the Armenian theatre and carried them out. The problem of language came up for special discussions. The moving spirit of that group was the translator of *Ruy Blas* [Rusinian].³⁷

The salons of all the Balianes acquired even more luster in time. The brilliant, if somewhat worldly, Archbishop Khoren Narbey was the favorite of the entire Balian family. That is why he frequented the salon of Anaïs' uncle, Kapriel

Gümüshian, whose wife was a Balian. It is there that he spent many a memorable evening with Khrimian Hayrig. It was in the museum-like atmosphere of Gümüshian's room, filled with relics of Armenia's historic and artistic past, that Khrimian Hayrig sometimes spent days. Surrounded by young and old alike, he told the stories behind these mementos of former days with simplicity and feeling as he took his listeners on his imaginary trips through time and space, inspiring them alternately with pride, joy, and regret.³⁸

The salon of Hovhannes and Aṙak'el Bey Dadian rivaled that of the Balians. In the words of Narbey:

The mansion of the Dadians of San Stefano was an example of the princely chateaux described in French novels. In addition, there reigned Eastern hospitality. . . . There came scholars, musicians, painters, and writers of every nationality.

All the outstanding figures of the nation gathered in that house. . . . After dinner, the older people talked seriously in the salon reserved for them, and the young people played music in the little one.³⁹

It was at one of these gatherings that the young clergyman Narbey was asked to regale the guests with a few selections on the piano, in the presence of Patriarch Kevork. The very next day, he was made by the displeased Patriarch to take an oath on bended knee never to touch the piano again. "A beautiful ray of light was extinguished in my soul," said Narbey, as he told the story years later.⁴⁰

The gatherings in the Ormanian salon were also intellectual and pleasing, for women like the future Mrs. Düsap added a feminine touch to them. Between group dancing and piano concertos, there were animated discussions about feminism in general and the social position of the Armenian woman in particular. The problem of ashkharhapar versus krapar received its share of attention as one of the burning questions of the day. Later Srpuhi Düsap was to have gath-

erings in her own salon, attended by some of the elite of the foreign colony and graced by the presence of her daughter, Dorine, whose musical talents were destined to be commended by Gounod and others in France, but whose life was to come to an abrupt end. Srpuhi Düsap entertained her guests in impeccable French and with the charm, delicacy, and grace of a woman whose social and intellectual education and literary prowess made her an ideal person to preside over such company.⁴¹

Even in lower echelons of society, there were salons worthy of the name, where young poets or would-be poets, lovers of art and literature, and serious and articulate young men and women came together to enjoy one another's company in an artistic and intellectual environment. Those who could play the piano regaled their friends with the best music of the day. Others recited poems or excerpts from plays in Armenian and French. Serious conversations were followed by witticisms and rhyming contests.

"Décolleté" feminine apparel was just as disturbing to the traditionalists as "décolleté" literature.⁴² A society in which romantic music played by a clergyman could result in the lifting of eyebrows and the annoyance of a Patriarch could hardly fail to be scandalized by low necklines and delicate, gauzelike material which revealed the arms and a liberal portion of the neck. What some women did with charm and grace was, undoubtedly, done rather awkwardly by others. Yet, in spite of criticisms and ridicule, the trend continued. Perhaps a factor in the popularity of "décolleté" clothing was the increasing popularity of the dance. Like the other European customs which went counter to the national tradition, especially where moral principles were involved, the dance encountered opposition in Armenian society. However, gradually, it made such headway that the annual masked balls of the United Association, where "dominos" danced in the arms of their beaux or, perhaps somewhat more prosaically, in those of their husbands, were great

events. They usually enjoyed the patronage and presence of some foreign ambassador. This prompted the conservative Arp'irian to write in 1884: "In any case, the dance and the ball form a vital part of our manners and rule over our lives. We can say that Constantinople cannot live without dancing."⁴⁸

Notwithstanding the dislocations caused by the movement, it must be said that it brought about Europeanization of the people. Looking to the West was an age-old practice for these "Europeanized Asiatics." The cultural renaissance which resulted from contact with the West, but principally with France, was merely history repeating itself.

REFERENCES

1. Ahrsam, "Literary Causeries," *Oriental Press*, 1897, p. 132.
2. Zohrab, "The Living Dead," *Masis*, Feb. 6, 1893, p. 66.
3. Anaïs, *Memoirs*, p. 62.
4. In a short story, the reader finds a girl, brought up on Zola, Prévost, Theuriet, and Richebourg, who refuses many suitors for various reasons, one of which is the lack of knowledge of French on the part of one suitor. She really wants a doctor, a lawyer, or an artist. Hrad, "Five Years Later," *Light*, Feb. 14, 1898, pp. 246-247.
5. L. N. Tolstoi, *War and Peace*, Vol. I, p. 2.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
7. V. S. To'shigian, "Wrong Education," *Light*, Feb. 16, 1902, p. 1.
8. Ahrsam, "Literary Causeries," *Oriental Press*, 1897, p. 132.
9. This and the fact that the school was opposite their house induced Anaïs' extremely conservative mother to send her daughter there. Anaïs, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
10. Demirjibashian, "The Diary of a Girl," *The Globe*, 1887, No. 3, p. 140.
11. Anaïs, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
13. A. Arp'irian, "A National Outlook," *Masis*, Sept. 15, 1890, p. 18.
14. P. K'echian, "Social Problems," *Masis*, Nov. 10, 1884, pp. 361-364.
15. D. K'aelegian, "New Manners," *Masis*, May 15, 1892, pp. 291-292.
16. Ahrsam, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
17. Shamdanjian, "Tomorrow's Generation," *Masis*, July 31, 1899, p. 459.
18. A remedy for muscular pains.

19. Perfumes.
20. An insurance company.
21. Cf. the transliteration "Cünar" in Cunard Lines.
22. *Orient*, July 28, 1892.
23. *Ibid.*, May 29, 1892.
24. Some of the other operas actually performed in Constantinople between 1885 and 1888, not necessarily at Pera, were *Mignon*, *Les Huguenots*, *Lakmé*, *Norma*, *L'Africaine*, *Faust*, *La Contesse d'Amalfi*, *Le Grand Mogol*.
25. I. M. Earle, *Turkey, the Great Powers, and the Bagdad Railways*, pp. 29-57.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155, 165.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 160-165.
28. The author consistently uses "roman" for "novel."
29. Mano, "The Novel," *Oriental Press*, Feb. 1, 1900, pp. 113-114.
30. "Purpose and Direction," *Light*, October, 1897, p. 1.
31. This would seem to indicate that the problems discussed by Arp'irian and K'echian were less serious than they thought.
32. S. Gülüzian, "The Fair Sex of Adana," *Light*, Nov. 4, 1900, p. 6.
33. The author uses the word "roman."
34. Lila (Vahan P'ap'azian), "The Girl of the Salons," *Light*, Jan. 19, 1902, p. 7.
35. S. Vosgan, *Light*, Jan. 1, 1908, p. 80. This was printed posthumously in *Light* in a group of quotations entitled "The Pearl Necklace." It has not been possible to trace the date when it was first written.
36. Kodak, "Short Monologues for the Initiated Who Have Lived in Europe," *Oriental Press*, June 11, 1901, pp. 470-472.
37. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
38. Anaïs, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-56.
39. Anaïs, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.
41. Sybille (Zabel Asadur), "Mrs. Düsap in Her Salon," *Light*, Jan. 4, 1903, pp. 643-644.
42. Cf. V. P'ap'azian, "The Décolletés," *Light*, July 3, 1900, pp. 8-9.
43. Arp'irian, "Daily Life," *Orient*, Feb. 18, 1884.

P A R T I I I

**THE FRENCH INFLUENCE
IN ARMENIAN LITERATURE**



The Romantic Movement

The influence that the French language and literature have had on our modern literature is much more important than that which Christian Greek literature had on our old literature. Krapar had already been moulded when the writers of the Golden Age made it flourish under the Hellenic influence, and already there existed a whole body of mythological and epic poetry before the domination of historical and religious literature. Our modern literature, the one that begins seriously at the midpoint of this century, is wholly the child of the French influence . . .

For our new language and literature, everything begins with the French influence. Commercial and political reasons make French a necessity in our lives and, hence, in our schools. A whole generation—the first educated generation of the Armenians of Constantinople—goes to France to study, and thereafter France becomes our country intellectually. It is the period of Romantic literature, and the works which are translated, corresponding with their noble and moving nature to our psychological state of the time, intensify our love for France to such an extent as to cause us to regard her as the country of light. Since then we have been a shadow, although a very small shadow, of her. Our boys have gone there for education. Our literature has followed step by step the vicissitudes of her literature. Our language has been patterned after her language. Our mind has embraced her spirit. Our schools, our manners, our styles, our everything has been copied from hers.¹

The following year, Demirjibashian expressed this idea even more dramatically in a characteristic outburst of enthusiasm for things French with his celebrated declaration:

Our historian is Michelet. Our scientist is Claude Bernard, our philopher Littré or Taine, our critic Lemaître or Brunetière, our teacher the immortal Rousseau, our oracle always the patriarch of Ferney,² our singer Béranger, our painter Delacroix, our charmer Renan, our novel *Madame Bovary*, our troubadour La Malibran andl . . . our dead is the hapless Paul Verlaine.³

In 1902, Mercedes, less dramatically, but more precisely, enumerated the different literary genres which had been cultivated according to the French pattern. He included the novel, the theatre, the fantaisie, philosophical studies, prose poems, letters, causeries, critiques, and travel literature.⁴ All the literary schools in prose and poetry found their echoes in Armenian literature. Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, Naturalism, the Parnassian school, Symbolism followed or competed with one another. With a wealth of material from which to choose, each writer followed the dictates of his taste. If he happened to belong to the school dominating the scene, so much the better. If not, he became a one-man school, but always his models and teachers were French.

The contemporary social, political, economic, and literary factors were of paramount importance in the creation of this phenomenon, but it would be a serious mistake to overlook the historical background. Armenian literature possessed certain genres and lacked others. The pre-Christian theatre had been completely destroyed by the leaders of Christianity because of its allegedly adverse effect on the morals of the people. From that moment on, there was no theatre among the Armenians until the modest efforts of the Mkhitarists of the eighteenth century eventually led to the theatre of the Renaissance. Armenians had epic, historical,

and lyric (religious, patriotic, love) poetry from the beginning. The latter received greater impetus in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as it freed itself more and more from religion. Historical, philosophical, scientific, biographical, hagiographical, doctrinal, and legal works nearly completed the written literary wealth.⁵ There was a vacuum in certain areas, such as the short story,⁶ the novel, up-to-date scientific literature, the chronique, the fantaisie, and the other forms enumerated above. Translations abounded in all fields from the very moment a literature written in the native alphabet took form. With few exceptions, literature, intended for a people who were compelled to carry on an endless struggle for the preservation of their national identity, was utilitarian in its goal. Because the church and the language were the most important cultural factors in this struggle, and because literature was created mostly in monasteries by the clergy, it took on a religious character.

Whenever outside guidance or inspiration was necessary, Armenia's historically Western orientation led it to seek assistance in the best that the West had to offer. Among the modern western nations, France achieved an initial advantage during the Crusades through its political and religious activity, and this advantage combined with the superior quality of her literature to make it that much easier for Armenians to look toward France as the source of enlightenment and salvation. In Adont's' words, the French missionaries became "apostles of the 'Armenian question.' The people 'who were seated in darkness, in the shadow of death, thought that they saw the light break through.'"⁷ In this respect, Shnorhali and Set'ian join hands over the centuries.

The Western Armenian Renaissance in the second half of the nineteenth century is a logical and inescapable outcome of the interplay of currents and forces whose roots reach deep into Armenian history, some even as far as pre-Armenian Armenia.

The first purely literary genre to be recreated and cultivated was the theatre, which had lain dormant since its abolition at the beginning of the Christian era. Although it had made a brief appearance in Lemberg, Poland, in the form of a religious tragedy, *Hřipsimē* (1668), it was not until 1753 that the beginnings of the modern Armenian theatre were made in the Mkhit'arist monastery of Venice. It took another few years before plays were written and produced with any regularity. The historical tragedy of *Tigranes* (1777), followed by Biblical tragedies such as *Job* (1779) came to augment the religious and national literature of the Venetian monks. Written by clerics nourished on ancient and modern classics, and performed by their young students, these plays soon achieved real popularity in spite of the fact that they remained within the confines of the school. Translations of ancient and modern masterpieces joined the productions of the amateurs to lend the repertoire greater variety and prestige. Side by side with the tragedies in classical Armenian appeared the comedy of manners, striving to follow in Molière's footsteps, always using the vernacular of Constantinople, and ever aspiring for the same goals—the edification of the audience and the development of national consciousness. While it lacked real quality, the theatre of the Mkhit'arists, through its pioneer work, prepared the way for the theatre which was to develop later in Constantinople.⁸

The Mkhit'arist monks were also the first to bring the theatre to Constantinople. Beginning in the Mkhit'arist school of that city in 1810, the theatre made its way to the Düzian mansion in 1815, and, thereafter, it became the practice to give dramatic performances at the home of some of the amiras. Soon, the Armenian parish schools joined the trend as people became more conscious of this branch of literary art. Nevertheless, in spite of the growing popularity and the increased volume of plays, there was no organized troupe of actors until 1855, when one came into being

through the efforts of Srabion Hek'imian. A year later, Beshigt'ashlian organized a group of amateurs who performed at first at the home of friends and later at the Lusavorchian School. On the other hand, Hek'imian, who had assisted Beshigt'ashlian's undertaking, was showing real activity with his group, and, by 1861, as director of the "Oriental Theatre," he was giving regular performances in Pera. Soon, other groups were organized, and the intellectual and recreational life of the Capital took on added zest.⁹ New school auditoriums combined with new theatres in various parts of Constantinople to furnish budding amateurs and professionals the opportunity to win the applause of their audience by a display of their dramatic talents.¹⁰ Actresses, at first conspicuous by their absence, came to give greater realism to the performances, and, by so doing, they shocked some and changed the conception of morality of others. Turks, who had at first been invited to the home of Armenian friends to witness dramatic performances, now had an opportunity to see Armenian actors not only on the Armenian, but on the Turkish stage as well. According to A. Talaso, the "Armenians played the principal part in the birth of the contemporary Turkish theatre."¹¹

The two major trends in the theatre were represented by Pakraduni and Hürmüz on the one hand and by Beshigt'ashlian, Hek'imian, T'erzian, Narbey, T'ghlian, Turian, and others on the other. The first two translated generally the Greek or contemporary classic dramatists exclusively in classical Armenian and consequently enjoyed no popularity, save in schools in connection with the study of the classical language. Their cultivation of artistic form taught the younger generation the importance of art, but their insistence on krapar hindered the progress of the vernacular. The second group wrote almost exclusively in ashharhapar, because it was writing for the common people.¹² All except Turian were alumni of Mkhit'arist schools and, as such, were under the strong influence of a classical

education. Consciously or unconsciously, they followed the old and new masters of the theatre, but they made concessions to circumstances. Armenian classicism took elements from the Greeks and the French, but it took its matter mostly from old national history or the Bible. The theatre-going public saw Armenian royalty and nobility declaim in modern Armenian prose. It rejoiced in their victories and grieved over their defeats. It cheered the hero and hissed the villain. It shed copious tears over the suffering of the early Christian martyrs of the nation and undoubtedly compared its own position with theirs. It yearned with Beshigt'ashlians heroes for the air, the mountains, the valleys, and the streams of historic Armenia. Above all, it saw the glories of the past and the valor of its freedom-loving heroes. It saw with nostalgic feeling that the Armenian nation had not always been in a state of servitude.

Hek'imian went even further in his classicism than Beshigt'ashlian by using a chorus and even verse. Terzian wrote historical and Biblical tragedies in the classical tradition. Janashian even sees the influence of *Le Cid* and *Polyeucte* in his *Santukhd* (1862),¹³ but Terzian likewise made a poor translation of Goethe's *Faust*. There are also some popular elements in his plays indicative of an evolution away from classicism. T'ghlian, apparently a popular figure at the time, cannot be judged as a playwright, because all of his works have been lost. Judging from the known titles, he wrote both classic and romantic pieces, but perhaps his greatest claim to fame is the fact that he taught B. Turian and passed on his love of Shakespeare and Hugo to him. The youthful Turian was no more a dramatist than the others, but he was a lover of the dramatic art. Like many of his contemporaries, he had translated and acted in plays while at school. At fifteen, he had secretly attended the theatre and received beatings from his father for his pains, but he had persisted, and he had eventually written plays for production and publication.¹⁴ The vibrant tones

of his romantic sensitivity gave a warmth to his plays which was lacking in the others. Moreover, by stating in the introduction to his *Theatre* (1871) that he had used real events in order that other playwrights "might try to write moral plays portraying contemporary family life whereby they might be more useful to the Armenian community,"¹⁵ he was turning his back on classicism before some of his contemporaries.

As the people became better educated in the ways of the theatre, and since the native products were insufficient to give it the necessary variety, foreign translations became more numerous. Hugo, the two Dumas, Félix Piat, and other post-classic playwrights became the new favorites. The stifling censorship imposed by the suspicious Hamidian regime on plays dealt a further blow to the cause of the Armenian theatre and made producers and public more dependent than ever on foreign translations (1870-1875).¹⁶

Before it was completely reduced for some time, however, the theatre had served its dual purpose, viz., 1) it had helped to develop the patriotism of the people by acquainting them with their past, and 2) through the use of the vernacular, it had contributed to the progress of the popular language.

While the theatre was timidly evolving from a classic to a romantic approach, poetry written by the same authors was boldly following the romantic tradition. Armenian lyricism goes back to the time when men first wrote hymns and prayers to their pagan deities or to their Christian God. Women joined nature to steal many poetic lines from the pens of mediaeval bards. There was an abundance of love, religious, and satirical poetry composed by the ashoughs of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, Romanticism gave Armenian poetry a new character by a combination of the many elements which make up the movement.

The young men who returned from France or Italy to Constantinople in the middle of the century were mostly

Romanticists by conviction. Even Krikor Odian, who had been eucated in Constantinople, was a Romanticist, and remained so until his death in Paris, in 1887. The great French poets of the period influenced them directly or (in the case of the Mkhit'arists of Italy) through father Ghevont Alishan. The translations of Hugo's *Les Misérables*, *Ruy Blas*, *Hernani*, and selected poems were read avidly. Lamartine's *Méditations*, *Les Harmonies*, and *Raphaël* were loved by young men and women alike. Chateaubriand and Musset had their translators and partisans, too. Admiration led from translation to imitation. Many are the poems written by Beshigt'ashlian, Terzian, Archbishop Narbey, Berberian, and Ajemian which bear the unmistakable stamp of foreign influence, but most especially the French. A poet achieved the height of glory when he was called the "Armenian Hugo," or the "Armenian Lamartine," or the "Armenian Musset," as was the custom.

A religious tinge had been given to French Romanticism by Chateaubriand through the *Génie du Christianisme*. After him, Lamartine, Hugo, Vigny, and even others whose literary activity falls in the post-Romantic period were far from shunning religion as a source of inspiration. Whereas for the French a return to Catholicism represented a reaction against eighteenth century rationalism, for the Armenians to devote the best part of their literary talents to the composition of prayers and the praise of the Deity was a tradition which had never been broken. Alishan, the monk, found it quite natural to sing the glories of God from within his monastic surroundings, and the generation which grew up under his magic spell at Venice and elsewhere followed eagerly in his footsteps. The seventy-six poems of the fourth volume of his songs derive their inspiration from religion. Terzian, Alishan's pupil, who loved his master and adored Lamartine, was able to take time out from the composition of love poetry to wonder at the miracles of the Creator ("The Death of Aaron") or to meditate upon God, man,

and human destiny ("Let the Heavens be silent, and Let the Earth Listen"). In the handful of poems which it was the tragic lot of the youthful Turian to write, one finds such titles as "The Child to the Cross," "Love One Another," "Complaints," and "Repentance." Archbishop Narbey's *Songs of the Emigrés* contained its share of religious verse, as did the works of other contemporary poets.

Alishan wrote with the Bible at one elbow and Armenian history at the other, that is according to Armenian tradition. He sang the glories of his nation's history and the beauty of its land, always with the nostalgic feeling of one who wanted to tread on the land hallowed by the blood of his forefathers, but who could not. Here, too, while the result was the same in French and Armenian Romanticism, the motives and aims were quite different. Perhaps the French Revolution and the aura of the Napoleonic period were instrumental in arousing an interest in national history, but it was not until after the popularity of Walter Scott's novels had reached its height in France (1820-1823) that the historical novel took root and Michelet wrote his monumental *Histoire de France*. In Armenian literature, the literary current was merely reinforcing what had really become general practice. Among the historians whose works have survived, Khorenat'si was the first to write in a patriotic vein. Others after him followed his lead, especially in those periods when literary activity became more intense. The modern educational movement, dating from the seventeenth century, had as its principal aim the prevention of the disintegration of the nation due to the inroads made by Catholicism. Soon, Armenian Catholicism, itself, took a more national aspect and culminated in Chamchian and Alishan, whose disciples played an important role in the intellectual phase of the Armenian movement. The way was well prepared, therefore, when the young Armenians returned from France and Italy with new forms of art.

History, patriotism, and nationalism were inseparable

companions. One could not, at that time, write history without recalling nostalgically the heroic moments in the nation's past and shedding tears over the tragic present. Aside from the domestic sources and the general political and intellectual currents of the nineteenth century, there was the literary example of Béranger, whose patriotic songs had given him an unique place on the nineteenth-century French literary scene. Some members of the Renaissance Generation had met Béranger personally. Others knew him through his songs. It was unlikely that his popularity among his countrymen would go unnoticed by the Armenian intellectuals of 1848. The patriotic song harmonized well with the Armenian state of mind, especially as the Armenian National Constitution gradually became a reality and there arose greater national consciousness. The popularity of the song increased as enthusiasm grew. Oshagan calls the period from 1850 to 1890 "the golden age of Armenian national songs."¹⁷ According to Ajařian, every school boy in Constantinople carried his pocket book of song just as he carried his lists of words.¹⁸ Terzian ("The Whip," "The Vineyard," "Your Imperial Highness"); Turian ("Wishes of Armenia," "New Dark Days," "The Sorrows of Armenia"); Beshigt'ashlian ("Armenian Heroes," "A Brave Son of Armenia"); Narbey (the volume entitled *Armenian Shadows*), and many others chose their subjects from Armenian history or Armenian contemporary life. Besides occasional verse, such as those welcoming the Constitution or eulogizing a person, there were poems singing the praises of old heroes or grieving over the misfortunes of the nation.¹⁹

While Biblical and national themes constituted two of the principal sources of inspiration, they by no means were the only fountainheads of Armenian lyricism. In the final analysis, Romanticism was the embodiment of individualism with all its implications. The ego had full play. One day the poet might sing the glories of God, another the exploits of Hayg, and still another those of Vartan, but he

sang also of nature, man, woman, love, and himself. Images might vary from the vague landscapes of Lamartine to the more precise and colorful tableaux of Hugo. Philosophies might embrace simple truths and nebulous aspirations or more profound meditations on the destiny of man. Woman might appear in all her bewitching charm or whimsical infidelity. The poet might grieve over his own genuine or pretended suffering.

This was generally a melancholy world, but, except where it was a literary pose, it was not the "mal du siècle" which dominated nineteenth-century European literature. Armenian life, itself, had a melancholiness which colored its poetry. In Beshigt'ashlian and others, sometimes a sense of tragedy combines with a spirit of revolt to create a disturbance in the reader's mind and emotions and lingers a long time. If poetry dealing with that life was less tragic in its tone and content than might be expected, it was due to the everpresent hand of the censor.

Béranger, Hugo, Lamartine, Musset, to a certain extent Vigny, and the Italian singers of freedom, have all left their stamp on the writings of this generation, but it is the French whose mark is seen most frequently and unmistakably on the form, content, and spirit of Armenian poets. After they reached poetic maturity, they were able to leave works which distinguished themselves by their originality. Beshigt'ashlian's poetry, small in volume, abounds in translations and imitations of the great masters, but it also contains some verses whose genuineness of feeling, deriving from the land of his forefathers, entitles its author to be called a poet. Beshigt'ashlian, like other members of his generation, felt that he had a mission to perform. For that reason, he wrote, he acted, he organized theatrical groups, and he went from suburb to suburb to make speeches on any occasion whose purpose was the advancement of his nation. He used whatever material he found appropriate for his purpose.

A comparison of "A Brave Son of Armenia" with Hugo's

"L'Enfant" shows to what extent this was true. The subject of the two poems is a child belonging to a nation suffering from Turkish oppression. In Hugo's poem, he is a Greek. In Beshigt'ashlian's he is an Armenian. Hugo's boy has blue eyes. Beshigt'ashlian does not reveal the color of his hero's eyes, but he does tell us that he has blond hair. He could, therefore, conceivably have blue eyes, too. Both boys are alone. Hugo's is leaning against a black wall, while Beshigt'ashlian's is leaning against a gravestone. In both poems, the author and hero speak. Likewise in both, the author offers the boy something with which to soothe his sorrow, and in both cases the answer of the young man is the same. The last line of the Armenian version is a verbatim translation of Hugo's last line. In both poems, the antithesis between the spirit of revolt shown in the last lines and the quiet melancholy of the rest of the poem is very strong. The contrast is made more powerful by the difference in the psychology of the addressor and addressed. In "L'Enfant," the speaker treats the boy as still a child and offers him things which may suit his childish tastes. In "A Brave Son of Armenia," the poet appeals rather to something abstract, that is the child's inner needs—the need for love and the need for freedom, especially for a boy born in the mountains of Zeyt'un, as this one is. There is one other major difference between the contents of the two poems. Hugo's child is "humilié," Beshigt'ashlian's is not. As for imagery, Hugo is more concrete. His pictures stand out in sharp relief. Beshigt'ashlian's, although they include "a vast stormy sea, wind stirred billows," and "a star-strewn wondrous vault," are more Lamartinian in their vagueness.

Perhaps the best synthesis of originality and foreign influences was made by Bedros Turian, the most gifted of the Romanticists. A reading of his "Little Lake" and Lamartine's "Le Lac" shows that he was acquainted with the French poet. He had, obviously, read "Le Lac," with which his poem shares certain elements. Turian's is not a love

poem. The subject of his reminiscences is a personal malady.²⁰ The fire to which the poet refers is the physical suffering which his illness causes him. This is personal poetry of the purest and most intimate type. There is no attempt to idealize or to philosophize in the tradition of Lamartine. Nor is there a desire to serve as a human sacrifice for the edification of men, although he pours out his intimate feelings in the same manner as Musset. The poet has a grief which he simply wishes to share with the lake. That grief comes from the despairing knowledge that he, a mere youth, is destined for the grave before he has had an opportunity to enjoy the beauties of life. Turian's vague imagery and quiet melancholy are typically Lamartinian, but he is not a slavish imitator of the great French poet, whom he loves like the rest of his generation.²¹ Turian had learned from Lamartine and Musset as one learns from one's teachers. He had assimilated certain principles and techniques, but he put himself into his poetry. His life and the life of his nation were the sources of his work, and he was capable of feeling intensely the sorrows of both.

For the Armenian Romanticists, Lamartine, Hugo, Musset, and Vigny were the gods of poetry. They read them avidly and tried to follow in their footsteps. There was a rash of poems about pretty maidens, the sea, the stars, the trees, the flowers, and the streams, tinged with melancholy and appealing to the emotions. If at times the muses of the would-be Armenian Lamartines and Hugos was stifled, and if at times imitation was too close, it was partly because of the awe and admiration with which they regarded their masters, and partly because they were interested in art not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. Translations and imitations were just as good as originals if they served to achieve the goals that they were seeking. An Alishan spread himself thin over a wide field of literature and scholarship in an effort to be useful to his nation. A Beshigt'ashlian squandered his literary talent as a playwright,

actor, producer, public speaker, and teacher in pursuit of the same goals. Had the times and the national psychology been different, he could have left many more truly poetic pieces than he did. The same applies to all the other writers of this and even the following generation.

The situation was no different in the realm of the novel, where Dzerent's joined the dramatists and poets who sought their material in the national past. His *Toros Levoni* (1878), *Labours of the Ninth Century* (1879), and *T'evotoros Rshduni* (1881), dealing with the seventh century, are intended to teach the lessons of history rather than to entertain his readers. It is the evils of anarchy and disunity that are portrayed in the first two as a warning to his contemporaries. This didactic tendency led him to preach and to show a patriotism, verging on chauvinism, which was responsible for the creation of super heroes. On the other hand, his innate literary talent enabled him to resurrect the past in vivid colors, to create some realistic types, and to inject a variety into his stories which make them readable even today.²²

Before Dzerent's, there had been other and less skillfully constructed novels, the first of which was Hisarian's *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*, published as a serial in the author's own periodical, the *Philologist* (1851). Apparently, the author thought so well of it that he translated it into French in 1869. Written at a time when Romanticism was already merging into Realism, *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* shows elements of both, but it is primarily a Romantic novel in which the influence of the European species is very strong. In his introduction, the author expresses the dilemma of the contemporary Armenian novelist by saying:

Where must one begin when writing a novel among a people which has not a single example of this type of literature? No matter where one begins, one must copy foreigners, or still more exactly, one must translate them.²³

He then proceeds to narrate his story. Khosrov and Mak'ruhi are brother and sister. The latter is the fruit of an illicit relationship between Dikran and the wife of an Egyptian bey, while the former is the son of the bey and Dikran's wife, who has been forced to submit to the bey. In the true tradition of beys, the two women are killed and thrown on the beach with their children on their bosoms. Notified of the presence of the bodies on the beach, Dikran buries the mothers and takes their children home. After they are baptized, Mak'ruhi is kept by Dikran, and Khosrov is entrusted to the care of a friend in Egypt, where he grows up to be a handsome and healthy young man. One day, fate, by means of a violent storm, throws Khosrov's battered ship on the shores of the Bosphorus behind the residence of the beautiful Mak'ruhi. The inevitable occurs when Khosrov falls in love with his sister. The author leads the reader through the uncertain paths of love with proper analysis of the passions and meditations about feminine whims and, finally, brings his hero and heroine to the point of revealing their love to Dikran. Now the reader is presented with the touching scene where the frantic father reveals their tragic story to the two young people. The ending is worthy of an opera as Khosrov commits suicide, Mak'ruhi dies of grief, and her father follows her to the grave a few days later.

The romantic features of *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* are many. In this tragic love story, the hero and the heroine are shrouded in mystery, especially the former. It is known that Mak'ruhi's mother is dead, but it is not known under what circumstances, and the reader is aware of a dark secret which lies in the past of this girl. Khosrov, on the other hand, is a complete stranger to Mak'ruhi and the reader when the elements cast him ashore behind Mak'ruhi's villa. The love which springs up between these two beings is ideal, not carnal. Chance, the god of the Romanticist, plays

a very important role as first the two victims of the Egyptian bey's fury are thrown on the beach near Dikran's residence. Then, a storm wrecks Khosrov's ship at Dikran's back door so that Mak'ruhi may meet him all the more easily. Thirdly, when the young girl, during a rowing excursion, is caught in a storm, Khosrov is on the beach to save her life by risking his. Fate, the great ally of chance, plays an equally significant part in the misfortunes of these young lovers. They are irresistibly drawn together by a hidden hand. They seem to be made for each other by character, personality, and mutual likes and dislikes. Their temporary separation might have been the beginning of salvation, but chance intervenes to bring them together again. Finally, they complete the tragic cycle of the family when they all die to go and join the two women whose misfortunes had put the story in motion.

The intellectual and emotional state of these characters is thoroughly Romantic. The following description of Mak'ruhi's library illustrates this vividly:

A well chosen library consisting of books in various languages was especially rich in poetry and novels. *Clarissa Harlowe*, *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, *Werther*, *Mathilde*, *Paul et Virginie*, *Corinne* and others like them were the intimate friends with whom she spent interesting hours. Little by little, as the ideas which she found in such books harmonized with her temperament, and mode of life and found a place in her heart, they left a profound impression on her. Petulant, isolated from people, engrossed in books which excited her enthusiasm and imagination, she developed a half-savage, sensitive character. Wrapped in this savage sensitivity, she often spent hours in deep meditation. On these occasions, thinking that she was in the company of *Clarissa*, *Atala*, and *Mathilde*, she compared herself with them, and examining her heart, she found a void, a deep abyss.²⁴

Later, speaking of his hero and heroine, Hisarian tells his readers that:

A melancholy, which had a hidden connection with their origin, an unexpressed hatred of society, love of solitude, and pleasure in meditation were the traits characteristic of both.²⁵

It would be difficult to find two characters more in the Romantic tradition than these two young people at the southeastern extremity of the European continent.

Yet, this is not all. The whole novel is pervaded with a Romantic atmosphere. The melancholy picturesqueness of the descriptions, the love scenes, and the analysis of sentiments bear the stamp of European Romanticism in which French plays the major role.²⁶ Exotic lands, sea voyages, tempests, unlikely adventures, scenes in the church and in the cemetery are other Romantic elements in Hisarian's novel. However, Hisarian was not completely oblivious to contemporary literary currents. The Realist touch is given to *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* by basing it on contemporary life. The scene is laid in Egypt in the mid-nineteenth century. There are descriptions of Egyptian customs and references to contemporary Society. The author even refers to real persons, such as Boghos Bey, an Armenian who had achieved a very high place in the political life of Egypt. *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* is far from being a literary work in the real sense of the word, but it is worthy of mention as the first Armenian novel.

In 1866, Hisarian published another novel which was likewise said to be based on contemporary manners, but it was just as extravagant as his first attempt with the added disadvantage that it was in classical Armenian, whereas the first one had been in the vernacular. Misakian's *Sofia*, conceived in Paris between 1855 and 1860, Mamurian's *English Letters*, begun in London in 1857, and *Armenian Letters* (1864-1867) are other Romantic novels.²⁷ Mamurian's *The Man of the Black Mountain* is an unfinished historical novel in the true tradition of that genre. Before Zohrab wrote his "half-Romantic, half-Realist" *A Vanished Generation* in

1884, Srpuhi Düsap was to try to graft George Sandian feminism on Armenian society, thereby giving birth to one of the most hotly debated literary and social issues of the time, even after 1900. Her epistolary novel *Mayda* (1883) was followed by *Siranush* (1884) and *Araxia or the Teacher* (1887), both of which were deeply concerned with the position of women in Armenian society, and which aimed at destroying the conventions and prejudices which gave women an inferior position in family and social life. Nevertheless, in spite of the temporary popularity of Düsap's novels, it must be admitted that Western Armenian literature failed to produce a single novel of the first rank due to the increasingly strict censorship and the lack of an outstanding talent.

REFERENCES

1. A. Chobanian, "Northern Literature," *Flower*, May 20, 1895, pp. 233-234.
2. Voltaire.
3. Demirjibashian, "To the Reader," *French Armenian Dictionary*, p. 1.
4. Mercedes, "A Misunderstanding," *Masis*, August 10, 1902, p. 503.
5. Some of these works are proving very valuable to scholars as sources in their studies of the Near East.
6. Of course, folklore had existed for centuries.
7. Adont's, *op. cit.*, p. 380.
8. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 295-304. Cf. also above pp. 59-60.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 309.
10. A. Arp'irian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, p. 32.
11. A. Talaso, "The Contemporary Turkish Theatre," *Revue Encyclopédique*, Dec. 9, 1899, cited by Chobanian in "The Armenians in the Turkish Theatre," *Anahid*, Nov.-Dec., 1899, p. 30. Chobanian points out that it was Abdul-Mejid who ordered performances of European plays in Turkish in the palace by Armenian actors. *Loc. cit.* For further details on the Armenian theatre, see Sharasan, *The Armenian Theatre and its Workers in Turkey*.
12. Hek'imian wrote five tragedies in krapar none of which ever reached the stage. Janashian, *op. cit.*, p. 312.
13. Terzian declares in the introduction to his *Joseph* (1872) that

he followed the similarly-titled work of a French author. Janashian thinks that it is Alexandre Duval's *Joseph*. *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

14. Y. Ek'serjian, *Comprehensive Biography of Bedros Turian*, pp. 47-48.

15. B. Turian, "Introduction," *Theatre in Poetry and Theatre*, p. 71.

16. A. Arpi'arian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, p. 88.

17. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 14.

18. Aja'ian, *History of the Armenian Language*, Vol. II, pp. 495-496.

19. Cf. above.

20. He was a consumptive.

21. In his school days (1865), he had received a volume of Lamartine as a prize for excellence in Armenian. Ek'serjian, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

22. For a discussion of Dzerent's, see Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-262; Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 451-487.

23. Hisarian, "Preface," *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*, cited by S. Ankeghya in "The Novel among the Armenians of Turkey," *Flower*, Sept. 25, 1903, p. 375.

24. Hisarian, *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*, in *Flower*, Aug. 9, 1903, p. 330.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 368.

26. Of the seven novels mentioned by the author, one is English, one is German, and five are French.

27. These are titles reminiscent of Voltaire and Montesquieu, but, by their structure and spirit, they resemble more the latter's *Lettres Persanes*. Manners of the day and real persons under fictitious names come in for much satire in the second of these books. Asadur, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-132.

From Romanticism to Realism

It is impossible to set the chronological dates of Armenian Romanticism. It begins with the works of Alishan (1840's) and continues long after the advent of Realism (1884). Te'rzian, Set'ian, Narbey, Hek'imian, and others were still regaling a segment of the reading public with their verses about melancholy memories or actualities at the same time that Zohrab, Arp'irian, Pashalian, Gamsaragan, and their followers were literally flooding the newspapers and periodicals with a new literature. Some were trying to embrace the new literary faith by writing short stories based on the contemporary scene, but they were Romanticists at heart, and these departures were only temporary. Others, like Sibylle, were able to make a more effective transition, but a high degree of Romanticism still permeated their works. In fact, even those who are considered full-fledged Realists were not wholly free of Romantic tendencies. This may have been due to the great force of French Romanticism which had captured the minds, as well as the hearts. Undoubtedly, it was also due to the fundamental elements in Armenian life responsible for the state of mind which was so receptive to a melancholy and sentimental literature. Those elements had not disappeared. On the contrary, they had become accentuated during the reign of the Red Sultan.

Like all movements, Realism did not spring up over-

night. Certain factors had been present which, in the normal course of events, would have brought it about. The Mkhitarist comedy of manners maintained a realism which predated and coexisted with Romanticism. Satirists of contemporary manners joined these non-literary plays to ridicule the vulnerable aspects of the Armenian society of the second half of the nineteenth century. H. Svajian, with his satirical semi-monthly *The Bee*, (established in 1856), and Narbey, with his comedy *A la française* (1862), preceded the greatest Armenian humorist, H. Baronian, who used his biting wit with devastating effect.¹ *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* was another literary source, for, while it was a typically Romantic novel, it claimed to be based on contemporary society, and it made references to men and events of that time. Khrimian and his disciple, Srvantzyant's, by turning their attention to the land, people, traditions, and life of the Armenian provinces from 1870 to 1885, also contributed to the reorientation of literature, as did the efforts of the Araratian Association for the spread of education outside the Capital.

Another element was the utilitarianism of the Renaissance and succeeding generations. Bent on reforms intended to benefit the people, they had to gain popular support for their cause through debates carried on incessantly on the pages of journals. It was only a short step from a leading article discussing intolerable conditions in the National Hospital to a short story whose more graphic depiction of those conditions was certain to leave a deeper impression on the minds of the people. Besides, it took less intellectual effort to read a short story than an editorial or a leading article, and it was, in addition, more pleasant. While there were a few central problems about which the major effort centered, those problems had many facets and ramifications, so that there was opportunity for variety.

The reaction against Romanticism played an important role in turning people toward a more realistic literature.

Patriotic songs enjoyed great popularity, but gradually the censor's heavy hand began to make its weight felt. The theatre, except for translations, was also dying fast. The youthful intellectuals of the time felt a futility in the further cultivation of the ego. They thought that there ought to be greater substance to literature. Romanticism had accomplished its purpose. It was time for a change. In all this, the role of French literature cannot be overlooked. Romanticism had come primarily from France at a time when it had completely exhausted itself in that country. Armenian Romanticism had been a prolongation and transference of the French movement. Things had changed considerably in the land which was the source of literary, political, and intellectual inspiration. New faces and new theories had appeared on the literary scene. New masterpieces had come to compete with and to supplant the old. Flaubert, Baudelaire, the Goncourts, Taine, Leconte de Lisle, Dumas fils, and others had been occupying the center of attention for some time. Zola, Daudet, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, and Maupassant were more recent arrivals on the scene. With these imposing examples of a new literature, the Armenians could not remain indifferent very long. The handful of young men who had chosen to give direction to Armenian life selected that aspect of literature which promised to become the best instrument for the accomplishment of their purpose and to be most readily received by the people because it met their needs.

The crucial date in this development is 1884, for it was on January 1 of that year that the daily *Orient* came to share the limelight with *Masis*. It was founded by some of the young men who had been responsible for the formation of educational associations in 1876. The purpose was not merely to break the domination of *Masis* on the Armenian mind, but also to give new vigor and direction to the Armenian press. These youthful minds, disillusioned by the results of the Treaty of Berlin (1878), anxious to help their

people, and failing to receive guidance from their elders, other than a patriotic sentiment, decided to take the leadership into their own hands. Led by Arp'iar Arp'iarian, these serious but enthusiastic young men congregated in the office of this newspaper to discuss and to formulate policy which was to affect the destiny of their compatriots. Greater strength and unity of plan were achieved when financial problems caused a unification of the management and the editorial board of the two journals—*Orient*, the daily, and *Masis*, the literary weekly. They decided that the realization of their goals depended upon closer ties between Armenian literature and the realities of contemporary life. This meant that Romanticism was henceforth obsolete and anachronistic. In view of the forces and tendencies which had been operating prior to this, the decision seems neither novel nor really revolutionary. What was most significant, however, was the fact that the two most popular journals of the time were going to dedicate themselves to the cause of a particular type of literature. Due to their influential position, not only could they recommend basing literary productions on life itself, but also reject those which did not conform to the ideas of the editorial board of the two journals. Few young, ambitious writers of prose would dare to defy the power of the press even if they had a desire to do so. With literature confined to the pages of journals, they would have nowhere to go. Seven years later (1891), the newly-born *Fatherland* under the editorship of Arp'iarian joined the *Masis-Orient* axis to control the literary taste of the public.² The doom of Romanticism as an important form of literature was sealed.³

Arp'iarian, himself, was to set the example by publishing his "The Price of a Dream" and "A Joke" in *Masis*, in 1884, followed by "The Condemned" in *Orient*, in 1885. Zohrab published his short novel, *A Vanished Generation*, begun in *The Globe* in 1885, and reprinted in its entirety in *Masis* in 1886.⁴ Gamsaragan, with his stories and one novel, *The*

Teacher's Daughter (1888), and Pashalian with his short stories joined Arpiarian. Hrant, with his series on the life of provincial émigrés in Constantinople gave more authenticity to the literary realism of the time (1888-1889). A study of the pages of *Masis* and *Orient* between 1884 and 1890 shows the remarkable regularity and consistency with which the small band of writers, gathered around these two journals, attacked the weaknesses of the national organization, the educational system, the management of the National Hospital, certain practices of the Catholics and Protestants, the Patriarchate, and especially the rich.

The birth and growth of Armenian revolutionary parties gradually began to have an influence on the literature of the time, too. The disappointments of 1878 had caused some Armenian leaders to turn their attention exclusively to internal improvement. With the organized attack of the *Masis-Orient* group on existing national ills, the attention of the people was being indirectly focused on the need for reforms of conditions over which the Armenians had no control. At times, there were fairly direct references to these conditions, but more often, with the intensification of censorship, they were rather discreet and understood only by the Armenian readers. Some of the intellectuals joined these parties. Arpiarian was among the first to do so, and Pashalian, his admirer and coworker, followed in his footsteps. Others came to swell their ranks. When these parties organized demonstrations in the Capital as a means of calling the attention of the Sublime Porte and the foreign powers to the urgency of reforms, and when they formed armed units in order to repel physical attacks by perennial oppressors in the provinces, Hamid's government took severely repressive measures, and massacres followed. Papers were suspended and their editors imprisoned or exiled in 1890 and 1895. Censorship became much more severe, even after an amnesty was granted. Writers had to withdraw again into their shells by being much more circumspect. It is an

interesting phenomenon that, of the nine stories written by Zohrab between 1887 and 1890 inclusive, eight have a genuinely Armenian background and attack vices and shortcomings existing in the Armenian community. On the other hand, of the twenty-two stories produced between 1891 and 1900 inclusive, only four deal with such problems and are characterized by the Zohrabian sharpness. Pashalian's case is similar. The latter even went so far as not to write a single short story between 1894 and 1898. The boldest of his stories was published in *Anahid*⁵ at the latter date, when he was in exile in London.

It was during this period that provincial literature made its appearance with Rupen Zartarian and T'lgadin'tsi. While more genuinely Armenian in the sense that it mirrored life and traditions quite free of European influences, it was unable to express its aspirations except by means of symbols. In T'lgadin'tsi, the reader saw the peasant and the small town dweller in all his picturesqueness and with all his faults and simple virtues, but he could not know what that man or woman thought, or what were his relations with his Turkish neighbors. During this period, the cult of form became the major consideration, due partly to political conditions and partly to the influence of Loti.⁶ This has led Oshagan to call the writers, most of whose works come after 1895, the "Artist Generation," although they are all basically Realists.

With the escape of many intellectuals abroad, periodicals were established in foreign centers in order to carry on the fight against Hamid's government more effectively. *New Life* in London, *Banner* in Geneva, *Anahid* in Paris, and *Shirag* in Egypt were some of the most important. Untrammelled by censorship, men now began to discuss freely forbidden aspects of life in the Ottoman Empire, namely: oppression, suffering, pillage, murder, rape, heroic resistance to the oppressors, Armenian history, and Armenian culture. Criticism of the Turk was bitter. Revolutionary

literature really flourished. Four outstanding poets joined their voices to those of the prose writers, as Siamant'o, Medzarent's, Varuzhan, and Tek'eian sang the sorrows and aspirations of their people. Stories based upon or similar to real experiences during the massacres of recent years appeared freely and continued to do so until the declaration of the Turkish Constitution of 1908. Pashalian, Y. Odian, Arp'irian, Mrs. Svajian, and Anaïs wrote some of their boldest pages.

After the overthrow of Hamid, there was a new era of hope and enthusiasm. The press and literature in Turkey enjoyed a freedom which they had never enjoyed before. For nearly seven years, they were able to write and to criticize freely, but that was the beginning of the end. Finally, 1915 arrived, and the light of the Armenian Renaissance in Turkey was suddenly extinguished completely.

Armenian Realism was a well-organized movement directed by a handful of intellectuals who had definite goals and precise ideas on how to attain them. It is true that there were a number of factors which predated the concerted action of these men and which would eventually have led to some type of literature akin to Realism. The French influence was still very strong, and, by following the French pattern, young authors would have produced something approximating Realism or Naturalism. The timid efforts of Cheraz, Demirjibashian, and Chilingirian which gave half-Romantic, half-Realist stories are ample proof of that. However, it is safe to say that, without the unity of purpose which was the product of a meeting of minds, Armenian Realism would have lacked vigor, just as it would have lacked consistent direction. With two, and later three, journals at its disposal, it controlled both the public taste and literary production.

This literature was utilitarian like its predecessor, and like its predecessor it was not interested in merely preserving the status quo or suggesting mild reforms without

unduly disturbing social conditions. It was moved by a militant spirit of reform. It was merciless in its attacks on the elements and classes it considered responsible for the ills of the nation. Arpi'arian's first few stories, including "The Price of a Dream," "A Joke," and "The Condemned," end in major tragedies. Social and religious prejudices, selfishness, and callousness cause the deterioration and death of the hero or heroine. Zohrab's *A Vanished Generation* shows how two sincere, devoted beings are forced to live in a state of social ostracism because of the bigotry of society. The hero of "The Surname of the Vartabed" buries his identity under the cloak of a priest after the girl he loves refuses to marry him, because she is rich and he is poor. The unscrupulous protagonist of "The Women's Doctor" parades his mediocre medical skill from family to family whose misery he exploits and whose happiness he destroys. "The Widow" portrays the tragic abandonment of a provincial wife by a young man who is lost in the moral desert called Constantinople. "Armenisa" shows the evil consequences of the fanaticism of some Armenian Catholics. "Nerses" terminates with the death of a young boy due to the inhuman treatment accorded him at the orphanage of the Armenian National Hospital. Pashalian's "Disillusionment" and "The 'Rest' of Galata" follow a similar pattern. Hrant's chroniques give heart-rending pictures of the émigrés in Constantinople. Everything is calculated to bring the weaknesses and abuses in contemporary life into sharp focus.

In the panorama of Armenian society, almost every class from the highly Europeanized aristocracy of Constantinople to the humble peasant of the provinces is represented. Nearly every profession from medicine to journalism and every occupation from printing to fishing receives some attention. The big businessman, the teacher, the writer, the engineer, the high government functionary, the servant, the sailor, the butcher boy, the married woman of easy morals, the prostitute, the faithful woman, the sincere man, the

hypocrite, the lawyer, the criminal, the émigré, and his exploiter pass before one's eyes in endless procession. They all serve one purpose—to expose the weaknesses of the social structure, the exploitation of the poor, the triumph of vice, and the victimization of virtue. As in French realism, the lower classes occupy the most important place in this panorama and understandably so. It is through the depiction of their suffering that the weaknesses of society can be laid bare. The wealthy are the villains in this sordid picture. They are the powerful who abuse the unfortunates who fall into their hands. They play with the latter's sentiments to the point of driving them to suicide or insanity. After a lifetime of service, the poor men and women are apt to be dismissed from their jobs for the most flimsy reasons. In this materialistic world, a big dowry and a high social position are more important than tender affection. In this hypocritical society, the true religious feeling makes way to interested religion. Money can buy a burial place in the church yard for an exploiter of men, but the sins of the prostitute who supports a little brother deprive her of the privilege of receiving communion.

Direct observation plays an important part in the technique of these writers. Hrant Asadur testifies that Zohrab often took his characters from real life. He often cast a veil over them, but sometimes that veil was thin to the point of transparency. However, he was careful to cast a thicker veil over his women in order to render them unrecognizable to all but his closest friends.⁷ Asadur also affirms that Gamsaragan used to take careful notes on men, places, and events before he wrote about them. He specifically mentions the fact that, while Gamsaragan was preparing his *The Teacher's Daughter* he met him one day in the goldsmiths' quarter of the city, where he had gone to observe the manner in which jewelry was sold in order to be able to describe authentically how the ring of the heroine was auctioned off by her father.⁸ Arpiarian states that the

heroine of his "The Laughing Girl" was Demirjibashian's relative.⁹ This realist technique was not confined to the three above-named authors according to Arshag Chobanian, who, in his defense of the new writers, has the following to say:

What do the new writers, the dissenters do? They walk in the streets. They look into every nook and corner. They visit the fields, the forests, and the mountains. In society, they observe everything. They note down and study events. Then they return to their rooms and write, having only their notebooks before them.¹⁰

Impersonality for these impatient, fiery authors was not always possible. Almost every line in the stories of Zohrab and Arpi'arian betrays the author's feelings. These two men were much more interested in the content and purpose of the story than the problem of personality or impersonality. The extreme form of intrusion is represented by the following words of Arpi'arian in the last paragraph of "The Condemned," addressed to the heroine as he returns from the latter's funeral:

You sacrificed yourself to your brother and your parents. . . . Your parents and your brother scorned and condemned you. They did not even have pity on you. A young man stole your heart—for who is master of his own heart?—and killed you morally and physically. Society praised him and condemned you. Nowhere did you find mercy. And yet God is love.¹¹

Sympathy for the victim and indignation against the oppressor is also a trait of Zohrab, who intrudes frequently and in various ways. One of the most forceful examples of this is found in "God Rest His Soul." In describing the funeral procession of a morally decadent man whom the church and society are honoring, the author says the following:

Slowly they bore the coffin of this man, who now seemed to be weighted down with all the frightfulness of crime.

Then the pallbearers began to sprinkle eau de cologne on the coffin. Those who were following it closely put their handkerchiefs to their noses. The decay of the body must have begun for, in spite of every effort, an abominable odor escaped from the coffin and filled the air.

This abomination, which was impossible to hide, seemed to symbolize the end of this man, the symbol of all selfish lives, and burst forth without waiting to reach the entrance to the grave.¹²

Others, such as Pashalian, were more impersonal, but it was not difficult to see their sentiments through the thin veneer of impersonality. Writers felt that not only must they portray the facts but that they must employ every available means to arouse the emotions of their readers. Hence, the comments, the comparisons, the philosophical reflections, and occasional outbursts of indignation. This attitude is also the non-literary source of the melancholy with which the works of the Realist school are imbued.¹³ With time and with the somewhat different conception of art of the younger men, much greater impersonality was achieved, but the all-pervasive melancholy never disappeared.

The "mal du siècle" makes its appearance at this time as authors portray characters who have the leisure to become preys to boredom. Short psychological analyses take their place with pretty or striking descriptions and simple narrative. There is a pretension to study contemporary manners, but there is no claim to a scientific method. Explanations of conduct on the basis of heredity and environment are rare. Of the four major Realists—Arp'iarian, Zohrab, Pashalian, and Gamsaragan—only Pashalian makes a fleeting reference to the hereditary factor in "Kevork the Fisherman." Later, this problem receives a little more attention in such writers as Zabel Yesayan. Bold (especially for Armenian society) descriptions of things which were heretofore regarded as private or unpleasant were a disturbing novelty for conservative readers, but all the criticism directed against this

element of Realism was unable to stop the trend. In fact, with the years, it became more pronounced.

Arp'irian feels that there is a definite evolution from a pessimistic to an optimistic approach. He maintains that as 1890 approached, the note of optimism became more and more apparent, because writers thought that the public must not be led to despair through a feeling of hopelessness.¹⁴ This certainly holds true in his case. There is a sharp difference in the outlook of the stories written before 1889 and those written subsequent to that date. The tragedies are still present, but there is a vague hope for the future if one works hard. "The Triumph of the Heart," "The Adopted Child," and "Red Alms" end on an optimistic note. The last named, published in 1904, brings together the freedom-loving priest who wants to achieve his goal by force of arms and the conservative businessman who wants to do it through obedient cooperation. The latter discovers the impossibility of such a dream and gives a sum of money to the priest in order for him to buy more arms for the defense of his church and his people. Generally speaking, Pashalian, too, may be said to undergo a similar evolution. In 1890, there is vacillation between optimism and pessimism, but, thereafter, whenever he deals with an Armenian problem, he ends on an optimistic note. One cannot say as much for Zohrab. He is a pessimist in his treatment of this subject to the very end.

The language of this literature is a vernacular distinguished by simplicity and clarity. The lessons learned from Flaubert and Maupassant were reenforced by the necessity of being understood by a public whose language was still in the process of formation. In their descriptions, writers give ample evidence of understanding the importance of the characteristic detail. If no other factor had been present, the very brevity of many of the stories would have obliged the authors to condense and to seek vividness in the most economical way. This helped to create many interesting

caricatures, especially among the best writers. Zohrab has a whole collection of such pictures in his *Well-Known Figures*. In true Realist tradition, the characters speak according to their social and intellectual position, with the result that Turkish words, slang, popular (but not vulgar) interjections are put in the mouth of characters from the humble classes. Authors like T'lgadint'si, who wrote from the provinces, about provincials, used many local expressions which were unknown to most readers. French words and expressions appear in varying proportions, depending upon the taste of each author, but the basic principle of clarity is the guiding spirit of most.

REFERENCES

1. Baronian certainly was well acquainted with the works of Molière and probably La Bruyère and La Fontaine. Janashian, *op. cit.*, pp. 398-402.
2. Arp'irian joined with a brilliant, European-educated lawyer, H. Shahnazar to found *Fatherland*. The latter gave up his lucrative law practice and risked all his savings in order to serve his people better through the press. A. Arp'irian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, pp. 182-183.
3. For a fuller treatment of this subject, see *Ibid.*, pp. 124-128, 139, 140.
4. The *Globe* had discontinued it because it was considered too risqué. Alboyajian, *Krikor Zohrab*, p. 54.
5. Published by Chobanian in Paris.
6. According to Anaïs, Loti's "capacity for feeling and expression, his brilliant style, and his heavenly gift for description had placed him at such a level that he was considered incomparable." Anaïs, *op. cit.*, p. 98.
7. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 244.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
9. Arp'irian, "The Laughing Girl," p. 60.
10. Chobanian, "Our Literature," *Masis*, March 10, 1892, p. 67.
11. A. Arp'irian, "The Condemned," *The Condemned and the Price of a Dream*, p. 59.
12. Zohrab, "God Rest His Soul," *Silent Griefs*, pp. 41-42.
13. A. Arp'irian, *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*, p. 161.
14. *Ibid.*



CHAPTER III

Some Instances of the French Influence on Armenian Realists

The literary source of Armenian Realism is French Realism. Part II of this study shows the extent to which French culture had penetrated into Armenian life during the second half of the nineteenth century. A few additional pieces of information concerning the authors of this particular period will help to show how powerful was the French influence on the Realist writers. Krikor Zohrab was steeped in French culture. After finishing his elementary education in Armenian parish schools, he attended the Institut de Genie Civil, where the lectures were in French, given mostly by French teachers.¹ French was the only European language he knew. His library shelves were full of the French classics, including the latest by Zola, Daudet, and Maupassant. French had such a strong hold on him that whenever he made comparisons, it was in terms of that language. A case in point is his description of an instrument of punishment used in Eastern schools. In order to give a more exact idea of it, he compares it to a "D," not a Latin or English "D," but a French "D."² He had read so much in the language of Racine, Voltaire, and Flaubert that he often remembered incidents and possibly images which he used as models. His language is liberally sprinkled with French words or with Armenian expressions whose spirit seems to be more French than Armenian.

In his short stories, there are some which have been inspired by Daudet and Maupassant. "The Responsibility" is a case in point. Daudet, in chapter five of *Le Nabab*, relates a story which has all the elements of a tragedy, but which Daudet gives a happy ending for reasons of his own. Joyeuse, a widower with four daughters ranging from twelve to twenty years of age, loses his job with a banking firm for having dared to criticize its unscrupulous methods. On his return home, he tells his daughters nothing in order not to destroy their happiness. Instead, he leaves early every morning with his portfolio under his arm as if he were going to work. He wanders from morning till night in search of work, but he cannot obtain any because no one dares to give work to a man who has been dismissed by Hemerlingue. After facing the coldness of people who were friendly to him before, he returns home with only part of the things which were requested by his daughters. He suffers mentally, because although Christmas is approaching, he does not have the money to purchase the things that girls like so much. Finally, however, help comes from an unexpected source, and Joyeuse is again able to lead a normal life.

In Zohrab's story, one finds Husep' Agha, a former businessman, who, having lost his business, is peddling goods for others on a small scale. He becomes the shadow and the echo of the men who do him the favor of throwing a little business in his direction. However, gradually they give him less and less, and one day they give him none at all. Deprived of his only source of income, Husep' agha wanders vainly from merchant to merchant with his black bag under his arm. He has two daughters, aged fourteen and fifteen, who call out their errands after him as he leaves the house in the morning. They are as ignorant of his difficulties as the Joyeuse girls are of their father's. Husep' Agha is received coldly by other merchants. His friends avoid him for fear that he will ask them for money. Gradually he sells

his watch and his furniture. When the day arrives that he has nothing more to sell and does not have even boat fare to return home from the city, he throws himself into the sea.

As can be seen, there are a number of similarities between the two stories. In both cases the protagonist is a timid widower, lacking in moral strength, who has daughters to support. He lives for them and is greatly saddened when he cannot give satisfaction to their youthful feminine whims. They call their errands after him as he leaves in the morning. He hides his misfortune from his daughters in the hope of finding new employment soon. He carries a large black bag or a portfolia as an inseparable companion. He wanders from morning till night seeking work which exists but which is denied to him. People are cold to him. His situation deteriorates and brings him to the verge of desperation.

However, here the similarities end, and the differences begin. The milieu of the two stories is totally different. The Joyeuse family lives in Paris, while Husep' Agha's lives in a modest suburb of Constantinople. Joyeuse works for a financier, whereas Husep' has been an independent businessman, who has had his days of prosperity, but who is now a poor peddler of goods for well-to-do merchants, who give him work as if it were charity. Joyeuse is the victim of an unscrupulous banker who does not tolerate criticism by his employees. Fortunately, he finds salvation from a totally unexpected source, but the only thing Husep' finds is a tragic grave in the sea. His two adolescent daughters, with their furniture gone, with every financial reserve exhausted, and orphaned by father and mother, are left to face a bleak future in a materialistic society where self-interest rules and where altruism, kindness, and charity have vanished. The portfolio which Joyeuse carries is just a portfolio. Husep' Agha's black bag is much more than that. It is a symbol of the poverty and needs of its owner.

All the exhausting labors and sweating activity of this man were in this Danaidean barrel which he had been continually trying to fill for thirty years without success. The whole struggle of his life was there—the problem of living, the problem of daily bread, with whose terror that leather bag was continually filled in its eternal emptiness. His joys, sorrows, and souvenirs were also there. That bag had good days and bad days. It seemed to have a changing destiny and a soul like its master's. Which of the two was the master? Thirty years later, when misfortune gripped him in its iron rings, this man understood that that inanimate bag had always been his master.³

This bag is not a mute tyrant. It is almost human. Zohrab goes on to give the following picture:

The bag shook as he hastened down the slope with jerky steps, uttered sobs, and made sounds like an empty stomach.⁴

Husep' feels lost without his black bag. Shortly before his tragic end:

He stopped when he reached the bridge. At that moment, he felt that something was missing. He asked himself and found the answer. He had forgotten his bag somewhere. He turned back. He ran. What for?⁵

The answer lies in the last scene of the story, as Zohrab carries his symbol to its logical conclusion in the following description:

On the silvery mirror of the sea, this body, with the bag hanging from its neck, resembled a ship which dragged a little boat behind it, far far away. They were tied together in the water just as they had been tied together in life. The bond remained indestructible everywhere. This stone-filled bag no longer had any fear of being emptied. It was the full, satisfied stomach, soft and swollen. Its place was not under the arm of men, where it had remained so many years folded, pressed, and suffocating. No, that bag, with its cruel obstinacy, its despairing emptiness, undoubtedly personified human responsibility. Its

proper place, therefore, was on their neck, just where it was attached now.

And after thirty years, like an exile, who rejoices at finding and settling at its proper place for the first time, the bag, with its coarse surface, was fondling and caressing the face of the man with every rise and fall of the sea.⁷

The tone is typically Zohrabian. A profound tragedy results because of certain social and economic conditions and the callous attitude of men toward the misery of others. The indignation of this well-to-do lawyer and sensitive man against the cruel aristocracy of money comes from deep within. It is second nature to him to fight against injustice no matter where it is.⁷ This was as true in 1912 as it was in 1887 and 1892.

Zohrab has not followed Daudet slavishly. He has taken a plot which suits his purpose excellently, because he can make a good case for the downtrodden against the powerful. He can attack the businessman, who is considered the source of many evils. He has changed some characters and introduced new ones. He has injected sufficient local color for the story to find a natural climate. Above all, he has given the black bag an importance which has completely transformed the story.

The technique of infusing an inanimate object with life and of making it a symbolic monster was used both by Daudet and Zola. The following description is from the former's *Jack*:

Now there is fear in every eye. The work has become formidable. It has received the baptism of blood and turns its might against those who had given it to it. Thus, there is a sign of relief when the monster is placed on the launch, which sinks under its weight and sends two or three broad waves to the very banks of the stream. The whole river quivers and seems to say: How heavy it is! Oh, yes, very heavy. And the workmen shudder as they look at one another.

There it is, finally loaded. . . . With the blood that soiled it

wiped away quickly, it has taken on its original splendor again, but not its inert impassiveness. It seems alive and armed. Standing proudly on the deck of the boat that is taking it away and which it seems to lead, it hastens toward the sea as if it could not wait to eat coal, to eat up space, to shake its smoke at the place where, at that moment, it is shaking its cluster of leaves. It is so beautiful to see that the workers of Indret have forgotten its crime, and greeting its departure with a last, immense hurra, they follow it, they accompany it with affectionate eyes. Go, machine, make your way to other worlds. Follow your straight and inexorable route. Go against the wind, the sea, and the storm. Men have made you so strong that you have nothing to fear. But since you are strong, do not be evil. Contain that terrible power that you just tested upon your departure. Guide the ship without anger, and above all respect human life if you wish to do honor to the factory at Indret.⁸

There is even closer affinity between the following portion of the description of the still of Zola's *Assommoir* and Husep' Agha's black bag:

The still, with its strangely-formed receivers, its endless twisting of tubes, maintained a somber appearance; not a fume escaped it; inside one barely heard a breath, an underground rumbling; it was like a nocturnal piece of work, done in broad daylight, by a sad, powerful and silent worker.⁹

The other symbol in this situation is the tavern, itself, which is the personification of evil.¹⁰ In typical fashion, Zola goes quite far in symbolic images and language as in the following instance: "Elle [la terre] était à lui, il voulait la pénétrer, la féconder jusqu'au ventre."¹¹ As bold as Zohrab is, he never goes this far. His situations, language, and imagery had already earned him a great deal of criticism in the quarrel centering around "décolleté" literature of which he was the leader. Even he must have felt the necessity of some restraint in the conservative society in which he lived.

Daudet and Zola are not the only French authors who have left a mark on Zohrab. Maupassant, the master of the

short story, had a general and specific influence on him. The structure of Zohrab's short stories is similar to that of the French master. Each one takes a little incident and exploits it to the full. These stories are little dramas of everyday life, ever so simple, but ever so meaningful. There is rapidity of movement and vividness of description. Zohrab is not always as skillful as his teacher, especially in style, but, at his best, he is able to seize and retain the attention of his reader with his short caricatures, his psychological analyses, his interesting narration, his appeal to the emotions, and his surprise endings. However, he lacks the impersonality of Maupassant. His frequent intrusions to explain points which the trend of events brings out often mar his stories. Moreover, while Maupassant frequently achieves almost complete detachment, Zohrab stays in his story. He is a crusader at heart and not a mere observer. Therefore, he makes certain that his readers understand his point.

One of the most outstanding examples of Maupassantian influence is found in "Storm." Its literary source is "Joseph." The latter is the story of a wealthy woman who is in search of new amorous adventures. She happens to have a handsome, virile, former theological student as a servant. After the proper psychological preparation, she asks Joseph to take her out on an excursion to the country. Feigning illness, she asks to be unlaced and laid on the ground where she pretends to faint and remains in that condition until the consummation of the love act. That is the end of her love affair with him although she retains him in her service, and he continues to love her from a distance.

In Zohrab's "Storm," a twenty-two-year-old widow finds herself on one of her habitual sea excursions one day. She speaks jokingly of marriage to the servant who is rowing for her. The topic of conversation, her manners, the slightly careless manner in which she allows her dress to reveal her ankle excite the servant, who is in his late adolescence.

They are suddenly caught in a severe storm, but the skillfully-managed boat brings them ashore. Really unconscious while on the sea, she recovers as Sahag, the servant, transfers her from the boat to the shore. Yet, she pretends to be unconscious in order to prolong the period of ecstasy. Once at home she develops a scornful aloofness which distresses Sahag. Whenever she speaks to him, it is with harshness. The boy, passionately in love with his mistress, finally loses his mind and is sent away.

Once again the similarities and differences are obvious. The basic lines of the plot are the same, but there is a difference in point of view, in tone, in motives, and in outcomes. Zohrab again wishes to criticise the arrogant cruelty of the well-to-do who take advantage of honest, humble people to toy with the one source of happiness which is left to them—love. For Maupassant, this is a little diversion. The heroine of his story, if she may be so designated, a baroness, relates the incident to a friend in a state of drunken gaiety. She is obviously a woman of easy morals, seeking new sensations. The French author seems to laugh at this unfaithful wife who wished to find temporary pleasure in the arms of her servant. Zohrab, on the other hand, uses all his literary skill to create a real tragedy with social overtones. His story opens with a poetic description of the storm at sea. It gives a dramatic beginning to a dramatic situation. It begins and ends violently. In one instance, it is a storm at sea. In the other, it is a tempest in the mind of the passionate Sahag. Zohrab's psychological analysis is precise and penetrating, and his prose evinces greater care than in many of his other stories.¹²

Woman occupies an important place in Zohrab's stories, just as she does in Maupassant's, and as in the latter, she is not presented under a favorable light. Most often she is pleasure-loving, whimsical, unfaithful, but irresistible. Zohrab's sensual nature is not attracted by classical beauty. The woman he loves may lack beauty by common stand-

ards, but she has something intangible in her eyes, speech, or manners which has a much more powerful attraction. He is profoundly affected by the appearance and the folds of women's clothes, as he is by the perfume they wear. The same is true of Maupassant's women and sensitivity.

Daudet, Zola, and Maupassant were Zohrab's teachers. He borrowed very little substance, but he learned all his techniques from them.¹³ The substance which he borrowed and modified greatly was the type of material which could apply to the situation in question. In making use of such material, he so transformed it by infusing it with his own spirit that the new product was completely in harmony with his own personality and tastes, as well as with the purpose for which he was using it. The impetuous, impulsive, and unpredictable Zohrab, with the unconventional moral code, could not be a slavish follower of anyone. If he made woman the center of his work, it was because of his own sensitivity to feminine beauty and interest in feminine psychology. Women provided material for his stories by confiding in him, and he explained it by saying:

They know that I like to concern myself with their psychological problems, and to be the historian of those bitter struggles, especially since my tolerant attitude toward their sins is a kind of invitation for them to talk.¹⁴

Zohrab's descriptions of people are rapid but precise, short but vivid. They are in the tradition of La Bruyère and Maupassant. He has a gift for seizing the characteristic detail and finding the "mot juste" to depict that particular trait which distinguishes one person from another. His prose is vigorous and clear, notwithstanding occasional gallicisms and lapses due to carelessness. Others surpassed him in polish of language, but none in vigor, imagination, and poetic expression. His poetic images run the gamut from the Romantic to the Symbolist, from the light to the grim, and from the serious to the humorous. His irony is sharp and at

times destructive. Zohrab has come to occupy the place of honor among the writers of his generation.

All the writers of Zohrab's generation were influenced by the French masters directly or indirectly. Those who had talent and originality were able to achieve a place for themselves in Armenian literature. Those who lacked them, wasted their time by becoming merely imitators. Nevertheless, no matter what their status, they were ready to admit their indebtedness to French authors. Arp'irian relates that in 1874 he had gone out one evening to purchase a volume of Hugo's works. He did not find it, but instead he saw a yellow covered book entitled *Fromont jeune et Risler Aîné*, and he purchased it because a few days before he had read a review of it in one of the local papers. He goes on to tell the remainder of the story thus:

The evening that I bought Daudet's novel, it was with curiosity rather than liking that I began to read it, but the more I progressed the closer I became to the author.

The plot did not keep me in breathless anxiety, but the delicate melancholy which emanated from the whole book conquered my heart. To tell the truth, Daudet was more charming at the moment than Homer, because it was the poetry of the life of the people around us. . . .

That novel was the description of a life foreign to us, but I saw before me the Armenian faces which were around me, and I noticed that they, too, bore the features of Sidonies. *Fromont jeune* became one of my favorite books, and, when I tried to write short stories, I did not know how to free myself from the influence of that reading. I saw around me a life which in its philosophical aspect corresponded to a few of the scenes described by Daudet and in the hurriedly-written "The Fool," I attempted to revolutionize the situations completely so that I might not be obliged to follow.¹⁵

He went on to read other works of Daudet and to distribute them among his friends.

A reading of "The Fool" reveals immediately the great

influence that Daudet had on Arp'irian. There are similarities in situations as well as in characters. There is an affinity in moods and in point of view. The melancholy which, according to Arp'irian, permeates Daudet's works is an important characteristic of every one of his own stories. Sympathy for the underdog, indignation against the exploiters of individuals, and ironic pictures are traits which the two authors have in common.

Arp'irian's affirmation that life around him corresponded to "a few of the scenes described in Daudet" is significant, because it explains the type of influence which was exerted by the French. The inspiration of the Armenian authors was the Armenian people, but the form and technique came from the French. Whenever this relationship was destroyed, failure resulted. Zabel Yesayan, who belonged to that group of writers called the "Artist Generation" by Oshagan, sought not only the form, but also the content when writing *In The Waiting Room*, thereby giving Armenian literature something which is Armenian "only by its language."¹⁶ This story of life in the waiting room of a French maternity hospital of the early twentieth century has no real interest for the Armenian reader.

As late as 1912, the French influence was still strong. Yerukhan, writing under the Zohrabian and French influences, gave to his readers a novel entitled *Legitimate Son* which reveals the author's close acquaintance with Maupassant's *Pierre et Jean*. In Yerukhan's novel, as in its model, the problem centers about the verification of the true heredity of a child. There is a detailed analysis of the various psychological stages through which the person (in this case the child's putative father) in quest of the truth passes. The establishment of the truth brings disappointment, sorrow, and violent death to the discoverer. The reading of the novel reminds one of the problem in the model, but the situations, the characters, and the incidents gradually leading to the denouement are different.

REFERENCES

1. Alboyajian, *Krikor Zohrab*, pp. 27-28.
2. Zohrab, "A Journey into My Memories," *Well-Known Figures and Short Stories*, p. 138.
3. Zohrab, "The Responsibility," *Life as It Is*, pp. 5-6.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.
7. As a lawyer, he tried to help in the defense of Dreyfus by sending his suggestions to the committee organized for the latter's defense. Alboyajian, *Krikor Zohrab*, p. 190.
8. Daudet, *Jack*, pp. 242-243.
9. E. Zola, *L'Assommoir*, pp. 49-50.
10. For more examples of symbolism, cf. Zohrab, "The Storm," "The Day after the Dance," "The Anchor," "First Love," "Delilah," "God Rest His Soul"; and Zola, *Germinal*, pp. 16, 34-35, 36, 78-238, 542, 543, 544; and *La Terre*, pp. 99, 107, 234, 517, 518, and 519.
11. Zola, *L'Assommoir*, pp. 49-50.
12. For two other stories with similar relationships with two of Maupassant's, cf. Zohrab's "Sweet Basil" and "First Love" with Maupassant's "La Chevelure," and "Une Veuve," respectively.
13. All of Maupassant's novels and short stories, nearly all of Daudet's, the best-known of Zola's were read in the preparation of this study, but the only similarity of plot discovered was in the four stories mentioned above.
14. Zohrab, "The Unfaithful," *Well-Known Figures and Short Stories*, p. 181.
15. A. Arpiarian, "The Forgotten," *Fatherland*, May 15, 1894. Gamsaragan makes a similar statement about himself at the time of the writing of *The Teacher's Daughter*. Gamsaragan, "Alphonse Daudet," *Masis*, May 1, 1893, pp. 262-264.
16. Oshagan, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 101.



CHAPTER IV

The Evolution of Literary Theory

Les lois de nos destins sur terre,
Dieu les écrit;
Et, si ces lois sont le mystère,
Je suis l'esprit.



Je suis le poète farouche,
L'homme devoir,
Le souffle des douleurs, la bouche
Du clairon noir;



Le songeur ailé, l'âpre athlète
Au bras nerveux,
Et je traînerai la comète
Par les cheveux.



J'irai lire la grande bible;
J'entrerai nu
Jusqu'au tabernacle terrible
De L'inconnu,



Jusqu'aux portes visionnaires
Du ciel sacré;
Et si vous aboyez, tonnerres,
Je rugirai.¹

These dramatic lines of Victor Hugo portray the role of the poet as a thinker who rises on his poetic wings into the upper regions, free and inquisitive, to pluck the innermost secrets of the universe. He is the high priest through whom the truth is revealed to man. He is the exalted being whose good fortune it is to lead mankind to salvation. Vigny, in a less epic tone, but with just as much conviction, had compared the poet to the second-hand of a clock, moving much faster than the other two, and leading humanity in the path of progress with his ideas and innovations.² Rimbaud had even considered the poet a Prometheus, the champion of the people against God and savior of mankind. He was the seer who opened the vast unknown by annihilating physical barriers.³

These lessons were not lost on the Armenian admirers of French literature. Krikor Odian wrote:

The poet perceives what cannot be seen, and he sees what others perceive. Moral man feels things intuitively. The poet foretells them. The Latins were right when they designated the prophet and the poet with the same word.⁴

Berberian was even more specific. For him, "the writer is the apostle of ideas" whose mission consists of "replacing the dark shadows of ignorance with the gradual enlightenment of minds, the false with the true, the ugly with the beautiful, injustice with justice. . . . [and] Satan with God."⁵ Demirjibashian, the individualist and worshipper of beauty, accepted the fundamental ideas of the others but expressed himself somewhat differently by saying, "Woman must play the role of an angel and the thinker that of a revealer. It is the task of the poet to declare the beauty of what is good and true."⁶ This is a restatement of the philosophy of "*du vrai, du beau, et du bien*," combined with the idea of a poetic mission. The poets were not the only men of letters who claimed to have a mission, especially in the early days of the Armenian Renaissance.

Hisarian's *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* was preceded by a foreword which contained the author's thoughts on the novel. In it, in addition to taking cognizance of the difficulties facing the Armenian novelist in 1851, he professed his awareness of the harmful as well as the beneficial effects of novels. Nevertheless, he felt that the benefits redounding to the reader through the development of the love of reading and through his moral and intellectual improvement were so great that they far outweighed any harmful effects they might have. "What progress is there," he asks, "when no one reads because he cannot find anything that will arouse his interest?"⁷ Before writing a novel, Hisarian felt strongly the necessity of giving a *raison d'être* for such a work in Armenian, and, for a man who shared the ideas of his generation, there could be only one *raison d'être* for anything—usefulness to the people.

Hisarian divided contemporary European novelists into three groups. The first group consisted of men like Balzac and Paul de Kock, whose aim was to portray the life and manners of the society of their day. Authors like Victor Hugo comprised the second class with their political and philosophical works. The third group included the writers with a moral purpose, who analyzed the human soul in the manner of Bernardin de Saint Pierre and Chateaubriand. Although, as in the works of all these novelists, the theme of *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi* was to be love, Hisarian declared that he did not belong to any one class. On the contrary, he intended to make use of different elements from each.⁸ His novel would portray love one moment in all its fury and another in all its wickedness; sometimes in all its naturalness and sometimes in all its artificiality. The author was not afraid to tax the imagination of his readers by the exaggeration of human traits and by the description of exceptional events. His educational aim was sufficient reason for it, but there was the added conviction that one could not invent anything which did not seem natural in

comparison with the wonders of nature. However, his goal was to combine a portrayal of manners with an interesting and edifying love story for,

the novel is nothing other than an exact picture of human nature and [contemporary] manners.⁹

Hisarian was thus stating the justification for a highly Romantic story with all its improbabilities before a contemporary social and historical background.

Many years later (1884), K. Odian was still championing a Romantic utilitarianism in literature. In the introduction of the translation of *L'Abbé Constantin* by his sister, he declared that consolation from reality was the aim of the novel. He maintained that it was the duty of the writer to depict the beautiful, the virtuous, and the noble sides of life in order to be useful to his people. Hence, his hatred of Zola, whom he considered to be merely exploiting the curiosity of the public by describing the sordid aspects of life.¹⁰ The fact that Odian had chosen a novel whose idyllic plot was placed on a more authentic social background shows that the excessive Romanticism of Hisarian was no longer in vogue, but the tenor of Odian's words leaves no doubt as to the literary philosophy of the man who adored Lamartine to the very end.

To Srpuhi Düsap, social utility meant the improvement of the social position of woman by espousing her cause in the form of "romans à thèse." All her activity as writer, novelist, journalist, and public speaker was devoted to the advancement of her sex. Since she took her cue from George Sand, the latter's influence is perceptible in her moods, technique, idealization, and point of view. According to Demirjibashian, Düsap's *Mayda* (1883) opened a new era by bringing new ideas and a new type of novel to Armenian literature.¹¹ Her *Araxia* won the praise of such a conservative as Arp'iarian, because he considered it a model of morality. However, he felt that it was impossible to compare

her to George Sand, because she was utterly incapable of the latter's love escapades and exhibitionism.¹² In spite of the praise of these contemporaries, Srpuhi Düsap's novels soon lost their freshness, and the epistolary novel failed to become a popular genre although feminism continued to be a burning question.

Mayda had begun a literary skirmish, for Zohrab, the ally of Arpi'arian and others in the fight for the triumph of Realism, had disagreed with Srpuhi Düsap and her supporters, but the real conflict of ideas did not come until several years later. The repeated allegations by conservatives that French manners and literature were corrupting the Armenian mind and manners gradually extended to Armenian literature as well. At first, the charges were ignored or received only mild answers, but as the little band of Realists gained in popularity and numbers, it became bolder in its reaction. In 1892, Zohrab, now editor of *Masis*, struck back with all the fury of which he was capable. After warming up to his subject, he declared:

Immorality is not confined to bodily deceptions. The sale of love is condemned undoubtedly because it is a fraudulent business, and yet how many men earn their living by falsifying their heart and soul all day long.

A lawyer who sells his skill for a few pounds sterling [Turkish] to defend an unjust cause, a journalist who pawns his pen and conscience for a set weekly wage, a doctor who insures the continuation of profitable visits by deceiving his patient, a young man who marries a girl only for her dowry—do they differ from a woman who sells herself . . . ?¹³

He goes on to say that he has no respect for those who remain indifferent in the face of frauds against society but who become pale before a pair of nude shoulders or an exposed bosom.¹⁴ Easily excitable people cannot read the description of a love scene or examine a painting of Rubens without being affected "and with this bitterness, they turn against our literature, too. . . ."

Only by its aim can literature be declared moral or immoral. Descriptions are a matter for art, and they can never be adduced as proofs of immorality. . . .

Modern French literature is the embodiment of magnificent art.

Balzac, Flaubert, the Concourts, Baudelaire, and Daudet are not immoral authors, but rather celebrated writers of whom France is ever proud. . . .

Indeed our family life, and our literature are far from being corrupted.¹⁵

A few weeks later, the nineteen-year-old Chobanian joined his confrère in defense of the new school. If this was his first serious attempt at literary criticism and theorizing on the pages of the press, it was far from being his last. For a long time, he held the foremost place as the critic of literature and shaped the taste of readers and writers alike. Chobanian began his article with the following definition:

By literature, we understand an instrument which interprets with exactness all the changes in the human soul, records faithfully all the voices of nature, gives the complete feeling of an object, of a picture, [and] of a scene, expresses minutely the most fleeting whims of the mind and the vaguest feelings of the heart. . . . Literature is born from the double impact made on the impressionable soul of the artist by the external and internal words, and it is the works of art that make the rules and not the rules which make the works of art.¹⁶

The young critic then proceeds to analyze the new literature. He points out the importance attached by the new writers to direct observation. While formerly writers consulted the classics and ran to books of rules before describing a fire, as well as marital life, the new writers observe life, itself, before putting pen to paper. He finds the secret of the success, the strength, and the source of emotion of this new literature in the shape of the nose, the crease of the trousers, the reflection of the light of the lamp, and the many other characteristic little details which distinguish

one object from another. To confine literature to the expression of generalities is to kill it. On the other hand, to endow it with all the innumerable little details which vary with time, place, nation, event, and the temperament of the observer is to give it eternal life. He points out that Pashalian's and Hrant's characters are real persons who stand before the reader with the marks of all their suffering visible on their faces and ill-clothed, dirty bodies, because the authors who described or created them were careful to point out all the minute but significant details. In painting the inner man, too, the new writers probe, torch in hand, into the darkest little corners of the soul and reveal its innermost thoughts and sufferings. Contrary to what the critics say, they have a philosophy of life, although they do not proclaim it in bombastic language. They have their feet on the ground, even when they lift their eyes toward the stars, but their philosophy is more eloquent than that of their predecessors. Their "descriptions feel, their portraits think, and in order to paint them they dip their brushes in tears and blood."¹⁷ Their philosophy comes not from books but from life, itself. It is all the more lasting because it is condensed. It is all the more profound because it is hidden. If Armenian writers have adopted many things from European literature, they are not to blame, because who can blame an author for being the echo of the literature on which he has been nourished. Nor is it too early to have a school similar to the Naturalist school, because if there is a European literature that is best suited to the needs of our people, it is Naturalist literature, for it takes its life and subjects in the very heart of the people. It interests and gives enjoyment to the person who can read, because he finds things in it that are close to his heart. Writers talk to the people, and the people like literature.¹⁸

Chobanian has clearly formulated ideas whose source is French literature. It is difficult to say that any particular idea comes from any one French writer, but a reading of

the article immediately reveals the fact that its author was familiar with the theoretical writings of Flaubert, Zola, Maupassant, Paul Albert (whom he mentions in the early part of the text), and others. He is ready to admit, as were others before and after him, that he and others have undergone the European influence (he really means French, and he says so several years later¹⁹), but he justifies that influence in the light of natural needs.

The ringing defense of the experienced Zohrab and the novice Chobanian did not deter Berberian from attacking the "new writers" who maintained that only Zola, Daudet, and *Figaro* were worth reading. Asserting that Zola saw only an animal in man, he declared that he would never subscribe to the pessimism and determinism of Zola and Maupassant, in whose hands man became a machine whose mainspring of action lay in his instincts. He could not, he said, remain indifferent to morality and progress. Nor could he regard the world only as a source of art.²⁰

A few months later, Arp'irian joined his voice to that of his fellow journalists and writers in defense of Realism. After pointing out that the new authors observed, suffered, and rejoiced with the people, he went on to say:

They are apostles who have a particular calling to relieve the pains of humanity, to alleviate its suffering and to seek a remedy to its misfortunes as well as to the evils resulting from the social organization.²¹

From then on, there was a veritable barrage of articles explaining or defending the new school. The Arp'irian brothers, Zohrab, Gamsaragan, Chobanian, Y. Odian, to mention only a few, deluged the papers with Realist or polemic literature. One of the most significant in the latter category is Zohrab's article entitled "The New Journalism," where he maintains that literature for the new journalism means being a faithful mirror in which all the changing

aspects of society will be reflected in their minutest details and in which one will see the physical and moral deterioration of a given individual. Obviously, this will not offer a pleasant picture, but those who are able to think will accept the ugly and the wicked as having a *raison d'être* in the harmonious whole, for they will realize that "the beautiful would not exist if the ugly did not, that virtue would not be seen if wickedness were not found, and that it would be impossible to rise if the fall did not occur."²²

In 1894, Chobanian became editor of the semi-monthly *Flower*, which he converted into a literary periodical. In it, he joined those who deplored the completely French domination of Armenian life and literature.²³ He suggested turning to the literature of the North, especially that of England and Germany, not only because this would counteract the one-sidedness of Armenian literature, but also because there was a closer affinity between the Anglo-German spirit and the Armenian genius.²⁴ For some years, a serious attempt had been made to overcome this defect in Armenian intellectual and aesthetic life through the translation of works by English, German, Danish, and Norwegian authors. Levon Pashalian had done his best to broaden the literary and cultural horizon of his readers with a series of articles in *Masis* dealing with Russian literature, but ironically enough, he had to do his research in Eugène-Melchior de Vogue's (1848-1910) work on Russian novelists, written in French.

In time, the critics of contemporary literature became more numerous and more articulate. New arguments were adduced for shedding the French influence and cultivating a literature quite independent of the one which originated in the country of light. The perennial argument of social utility constituted the foundation of all criticisms and remedies. On the one hand, B. Kololian, lamenting the unhealthy influence of a "sick literature" whose descriptions of rapes, murders, nocturnal escapades, and analyses of abnormal psy-

chological states struck terror to the heart of the reader or led him morbidly on to seek more of it, suggested a healthy literature in order to have a healthy people.²⁵ On the other, M. Shamdanjian made a plea to cultivate a "littérature à tendance" as the most useful instrument for the advancement of the nation.²⁶

In the meantime, two new developments had taken place. Although the literary creation of the writers of Constantinople had been based on life and problems in that city, gradually and indirectly attention was turned toward the provincials and their problems. It began with a preoccupation with the life of the émigrés in the Capital. Zohrab treated the question in "The Widow" (1888). Hrant devoted a whole series, "From the Life of Emigrés" (1888-1889), to the portrayal of the life of the humble workers who had left their homes in order to seek economic improvement in Constantinople. Kegham Der Gerabedian began (1889) to send descriptive and narrative pages based on the life of his native province. R. Zartarian entered the scene in 1890 with his literary folklore and provincial pictures and was followed by his teacher, T'lgadint'si, in 1893. There was a growing sentiment that, in order that it might be more truly native, literature should be based on the life of the Armenians in the provinces. The mounting criticism of contemporary fiction, combined with the increasing number of provincial writers, led *Masis* to open a forum on the matter by making the following announcement on June 24, 1900:

Literature is true and sincere only when it appears as the written reflection and record of old and new phases of the life of the race to which it belongs, expressing itself according to its basic aesthetic and literary temperament.

After accepting this *assertion*²⁷ in principle,

A. Do you think that our race is capable of creating a truly Armenian literature?

B. Does the present-day literature of the Armenians in Tur-

key fulfill the conditions of the type of literature described above? Is Constantinople, as the principal center of the intellectual life of the Armenians in Turkey, capable of giving birth to that literature in all its fullness and perfection?

- C. Do you think that the Armenian literature of Constantinople needs a new source of inspiration? If so, in what direction and with what spirit do you desire our literature to evolve in the future?
- D. What do you think of provincial literature? According to you, is provincial literature capable of realizing the evolution mentioned, or is its *raison d'être* acceptable only as a variation or a branch?

If you accept the importance of provincial literature and its superiority over that of Constantinople from the point of view of the realization of originality and a purely Armenian inspiration, what are the means by which provincial writers would be enabled to execute the plan?

Under those circumstances, what would be the role of the writer of Constantinople with regard to the literature of tomorrow and what do you think of his future? ²⁸

The stage was set for a heated debate, which sometimes deteriorated into a dispute, as many of the papers opened their pages to those who wished to take part. The debate lasted for nearly a year. In most cases, the problem became moral vs. immoral, or provincial literature versus the literature of the Capital. The other aspects were almost completely neglected. Berberian, one of the staunchest defenders of the literary production of Constantinople, maintained that the authors of the Capital had given as Armenian a literature as possible. He pointed out that Constantinople was subject to European influences, that Armenian manners had been modified, and that authors pictured those manners. Furthermore, he said, to base a literature on provincial life would make it more national but, at the same time, less human in scope. The question of provincial dialects was another thorny problem. The language of

Constantinople had become the literary language of all Western Armenians. Everyone understood it while the provincial dialects were understood only by the native inhabitants.²⁹

Perhaps the strongest case for provincial literature was made by Zartarian and Ardashes Harunt'yunian. The former contended that the literature of Constantinople was foreign-bred and foreign.³⁰ It was as different from provincial literature as Constantinople was from the provinces. Consequently, the writers lacked ideas because they were too busy cultivating the "moi." Nowhere is the greater "moi" perceptible.³¹ He suggested cultivating the words, idioms, and sayings of the provinces, not only as a means of giving the written language a more Armenian flavor, but also of enriching it. He recommended fiction which studied closely the manners and psychology of the people in order to educate them morally and intellectually by painting an exact picture of the inner and outer man. Zartarian felt that a vigorous development was necessary in lyric and pastoral poetry based on contemporary life, folklore, and national traditions. Satire and the song were two other areas which should receive attention. Only the native provinces could furnish the needs which create a national art. After all this was accomplished, Armenians would be ready to follow European intellectuals.³² The debate was inconclusive, but it made readers and writers think. Its echoes continued long after it was closed by the journal which had sponsored it. It showed, moreover, that the provincial men of letters and intellectuals had reached maturity. They had learned their art from Europe, directly or through the writers of the Capital, but they gave a literature whose inspiration came from the centuries-old native soil.

In this debate, some of the writers had stressed the necessity of ideas in literature. They had charged that the writers of Constantinople, having dedicated themselves to the cultivation of "l'art pour l'art," were lacking in ideas.

They were firm in their belief that literature without ideas was destined to die, and in order to obviate this eventuality, they suggested seeking inspiration in national life, history, and traditions.

Whereas before 1890, the substance and aim of literature had taken precedence over form, after that date, for reasons given above, form assumed greater importance.³³ Demirjibashian, the eternal worshipper of the goddess of beauty, had undoubtedly followed the utilitarian trend unwillingly. It is not difficult to imagine his delight at the prospect of exercising his freedom to follow art as he understood it. In 1901, in the midst of the literary debate, *Masis* printed an article which was purely aesthetic in nature. In it, the author, apparently inspired by Hugo and Baudelaire, asserted that "beauty, in its evolution, goes toward the ugly . . . or that the ugly has its own particular beauty."³⁴ Almost two months later, he was digressing from his discussion of the origin of the word "noravibag" (a variation of the translation for "nouvelle") to say: "I think . . . that that literature is sincere which has only one motto—Art for art's sake."³⁵ Any literature, he went on, that pretends to influence manners is deceiving itself.³⁶ In June, in another digression, he declared, "A true work of art is more moral than any book or sermon on morality."³⁷

A few years later (1905), Zabel Yesayan expressed similar thoughts in a discussion of the responsibility of the journalist and the novelist. The former, she affirmed, had a responsibility, as leader of the people, to be modest and noble. The problem of the novelist was quite different:

for true and pure beauty represents an interest above and beyond the limits of usefulness. The writer or the poet does not write for the crowd. His impelling motive is the necessity to express himself and those individuals who are his intellectual equals can profit from it. What he gives is pleasure, and he has responsibilities only to those who are capable of enjoying him. The more his work approaches supreme beauty, the more his

soul, free of suffering, becomes intimate and is loved by those who understand him.³⁸

She cites Baudelaire and Verlaine as exemplifying poets who wrote in order to satisfy the urge to express themselves, oblivious to the problem of being understood by the masses.³⁹ As for the critics, she maintains that it is their duty not to say whether a given artistic creation should have been this or that, but rather whether the artist has succeeded in achieving his goal.⁴⁰ Zabel Yesayan was familiar with French literary theory and practice. A comparison of the above statement with the following opinion of Maupassant shows how closely she shared his views:

The artist tries, succeeds, or fails. The critic must appreciate the result only according to the effort; and he does not have the right to be concerned with tendencies.⁴¹

If they are judging a character, they should judge it according to whether he is the logical result of the interplay of his temperament, the milieu, and the given circumstances.⁴²

Once again, the affinity with the French masters is obvious. Both Zola and Maupassant had stated their desire to show the influence of the environment and circumstances on temperaments. Their purpose was to observe and to be able to say, "Tel homme de tel tempérament, dans tel cas, fera ceci."⁴³

In a sense, Zabel Yesayan was describing and justifying her own practices. With a thoroughly French educational background, she based an appreciable number of her stories on Parisian life. Her work was the exemplification of art for art's sake on a strongly Realist background. She changed her direction as circumstances changed. In her lifetime, she traveled from Constantinople to Paris, to Armenia, and eventually died there. Her literature reflects the vicissitudes of her life and the evolution of her mind and taste.

It has not been possible to obtain the theoretical writings of Medzarent's, Siamant'o, Varuzhan, and T'ek'eian in

order to make a comparison, but it is known that they, too, bear the marks of Hugo, Verhaeren, Baudelaire, and the Symbolist school. T'ek'eian, especially, was a great admirer of Baudelaire, whom he translated, and whose preferred poetic form—the sonnet—he cultivated. In view of the extensive influence which had descended on modern Armenian literature like an immense blanket, it is not surprising. Had it been possible to obtain their critical utterances and analyses, it is certain that the evidence of the impact of their artistic and intellectual parents would have been found, although much more transformed and in harmony with their own genius and the genius of their nation.

REFERENCES

1. V. Hugo, *Les Contemplations*, Vol. II, pp. 194-196.
2. A. de Vigny, "Lettre à Lord*** sur la soirée du 24 octobre, 1829," *Le More de Venise in Oeuvres Complètes*, p. 281.
3. A. Rimbaud, "Lettre du 15 mai, 1871" (à Paul Demeney), *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. II, *Correspondance*, p. 30.
4. K. Odian, "Meditations," T'evotig, *Almanac*, 1908, p. 59. These "Meditations" are a series of quotations collected from the writings of Odian by T'evotig for this issue of his *Almanac*. The same is true of the next two quotations.
5. R. Berberian, "R. H. Berberian," T'evotig, *Almanac*, 1908, pp. 185-186.
6. Demirjibashian, "Yeghya" [Demirjibashian], T'evotig, *Almanac*, 1908, p. 182.
7. Hisarian, "Preface," *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*, cited by Ankeghya in "The Novel among the Armenians of Turkey," *Flower*, September 25, 1903, p. 375.
8. Asadur, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-37.
9. Hisarian, "Preface," *Khosrov yev Mak'ruhi*, cited by Ankeghya, *op. cit.*, p. 375.
10. Asadur, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
11. Demirjibashian, "Mayda," *Literary and Philosophical Movement*, Vol. I, January, 1883, pp. 155-156.
12. A. Arp'arian, "Daily Life," *Orient*, November 29, 1886.
13. Zohrab, "Immoral Literature," *Masis*, February 14, 1892, pp. 41-42.
14. At this point, he quotes the following lines from Molière's *Tartuffe* in Armenian: "Ahl mon Dieu, je vous prie, / . . . Couvrez ce sein qu je ne saurais voir." Molière, *Tartuffe*, Act III, scene 2.

15. Zohrab, "Immoral Literature," *Masis*, February 14, 1892, pp. 42-43.
16. Chobanian, "Our Literature," *Masis*, March 10, 1892, p. 67.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
18. *Ibid.*
19. See above, p. 195.
20. Berberian, "New Writers," *Orient*, March 21, 1892.
21. Arp'arian, "Literary Schools," *Fatherland*, July 12, 1892.
22. Zohrab, "The New Journalism," *Masis*, August 1, 1892, p. 159.
23. Cf. above, p. 195.
24. Chobanian, "Northern Literature," *Flower*, May 20, 1895, pp. 232-238.
25. B. Kololian, "The Sick Pen," *Masis*, June 5, 1899, pp. 365-366.
26. M. Shamdanjian, "The Useful in Our Literature," *Masis*, August 28, 1899, pp. 490-492.
27. This word is in French and in heavy type.
28. "The Literature of Tomorrow," *Masis*, June 24, 1900, p. 401.
29. Berberian, "The Literary Problem," *Masis*, March 10, 1901, p. 146.
30. Harut'yunian said that Zohrab, Düsap, Beshigt'ashlian, and others were primarily writers in the Armenian language. Harut'yunian, "The Literary Problem and Ret'evos Efendi Berberian," *Masis*, April 7, 1901, p. 219. However, this view was not shared by everyone in his camp. In general, Zohrab enjoyed the respect of the writers of his time.
31. This idea is reminiscent of Rimbaud's famous "Je est un autre," "Lettre du 15 mai, 1871."
32. R. Zartarian, "The Literature of Tomorrow," *Masis*, December 23, 1900, pp. 629-632.
33. See above, pp. 217-219.
34. Demirjibashian, "The Evolution of Beauty," *Masis*, March 17, 1901, p. 168.
35. Demirjibashian, "Nouvelle," *Masis*, May 12, 1901, p. 310.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 310-311.
37. Demirjibashian, "The Question of Art and Morality," *Masis*, June 17, 1901, p. 371.
38. Z. Yesayian, "The Journalist and the Writer," *Masis*, June 4, 1905, p. 226.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
40. Yesayian, "The Adventures of an Ingénu," *Masis*, February 16, 1908, p. 240.
41. Maupassant, "Le Roman," *Pierre et Jean*, p. xxxvi.
42. Yesayian, "The Adventures of an Ingénu," *Masis*, February 16, 1908, p. 240.
43. Maupassant, *op. cit.*, p. xlii.

Conclusion

It has been the destiny of the Armenian people to inhabit a geographical area whose strategic position has made it a coveted prize in the struggle between the East and the West. Armies of soldiers, merchantmen, and missionaries have sought to dominate the land, the life, the mind, and the spirit of the people. Thus, throughout their existence, the Armenians have had to carry on a constant struggle on military, intellectual, and religious grounds for the preservation of their identity. Faced with annihilation and assimilation, they have fought with every means at their disposal. The cross has joined the sword, and the mind has joined the spirit in a battle which, at times, has seemed desperate and hopeless, but after every setback, the traditional resiliency of the race has asserted itself. Long centuries of domination by Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, and Turks has been unable to kill its spirit. After nearly five hundred years of stultifying existence under the heel of the Turk, the Armenians were able to marshall their energies for a supreme effort for political and cultural regeneration. They succeeded to a great extent, but that very success was the undoing of the Western Armenians.

In this tremendous struggle, the Armenian people have shown themselves receptive to outside currents, but they have always adapted what they have taken from others to their own needs and concepts. Sometimes a period of assimi-

lation has had to precede adaptation, but the latter has come eventually. This is apparent in their language, religion, and literature. They have adhered to what they consider to be right with ferocious tenacity and through incredibly difficult circumstances.

Perhaps the thing that stands out even more than the others is that in the cultural struggle for supremacy over the Armenian Plateau, over this bridge between the East and the West, Armenians have unhesitatingly and irrevocably cast their lot with the West. From the end of the seventh century B.C. to the twentieth century, Armenia, an Asiatic nation, born in Asiatic surroundings, and encircled by Asiatic powers, has turned its back on its milieu and has sought to identify itself with the West. It cannot be said that this was due to the expectation of political gains, because this westward orientation dates from the time of the Armenians. The same is true of Tigranes, who spent some of his best years in a military struggle with mighty Rome. The struggle with the Greeks is just as conclusive proof of the absence of ulterior motives. If at times the Armenians sought and felt entitled to the assistance of Western religious and secular powers, it was because, after centuries of struggle to keep the torch of western civilization burning in the heart of Asia Minor, they thought that the Christian World owed it to itself and to humanity to extend them a helping hand. Unfortunately, international politics are not guided by humanitarian or altruistic motives. The price asked was more than they were willing to pay, because they had already paid heavily for the privilege of remaining Christians in a region dominated by pagans and Moslems. Guided by an idealism which was bound to be submerged under the realities of power politics, they became indignant at the nations by whom they considered themselves to have been betrayed on the battlefield and at the conference table. Yet, once the initial wave of disappointment had passed, they resumed their march toward what they

thought to be the right goal. The desperate conditions of the nation caused sporadic departures from this idealism, but there was always a reversion to it. Sometimes, their aspirations toward what they considered to represent the best in civilization led them to the extremes of imitation with all its undesirable effects, but in time the common sense and genius of the race reasserted themselves.

The contact with France was begun in the twelfth century, but it did not reach its zenith until the middle of the nineteenth. Then, within a relatively short time, it revolutionized the political, intellectual, and literary phases of Armenian life. Even manners changed under the impact of currents emanating from France and reaching the shores of the Bosphorus. France became synonymous with progress. It became the source of inspiration. Its great men were worshipped even more reverently than they were by their compatriots. Those who wished to receive higher education went to France, where they listened with awe to the great literary, intellectual, and political figures of the age. After they returned, they remained faithful disciples of their masters. They followed diligently in their footsteps, and they were not ashamed to admit it. They tried to apply their education to the task of improving their nation. If the remedies seemed at times to follow too closely the French pattern, they were not worried, because they were convinced that it was the right thing to do. One is not ashamed to use the knowledge and skills that one learns in school. In the fullest sense of the word, France was their teacher, and they were proud of that fact. By the end of the century, French cultural hegemony caused concern even among the Francophiles. There were efforts made to turn the attention of Armenians toward Russia, Germany, and England. Students went to study in those countries, but, compared to those who still preferred France, their numbers were very small. Generations of intellectuals educated in the French language, literature, and ideas, whose only

foreign language other than Turkish was French, could not suddenly change direction. Therefore, the trend continued in spite of increasing political and economic competition from Germany.

An analysis of the Armenian Renaissance of the nineteenth century reveals remarkable similarities with the French Renaissance of the sixteenth. In both instances, it was the outside contact which kindled the flames. France made contact with antiquity through Italy. Armenia made contact with antiquity, and with Western Europe, but it was France which completely overshadowed the others. The Armenian mind was nourished on French literature as if it were its own. In both countries the Renaissance engendered love of learning. Demirjibashian read the German philosophers, memorized Spencer, and deified Littré. The poets and dramatists read, translated, quoted, and imitated their counterparts. Every one of the leaders wanted to learn and to pass his learning on to the people. Like Rabelais and Montaigne, every Armenian who could hold a pen was concerned with and expressed his views on the problem of education. The nature of that problem differed in the two countries, but the problem and the interest were there. The desire to enrich the literary genres through imitation was of paramount importance for the Armenians just as it had been for the Pléiade. There was the question of language, too. French was experiencing real growth in the sixteenth century, just as the Armenian vernacular was in the nineteenth. Spelling problems existed in both instances. The abundance of gallicisms in Armenian literature is reminiscent of the Italianisms of the sixteenth century. There was even a religious question. While Armenians did not take up arms against one another, the tension among Catholics, Protestants, and members of the Armenian Church was so great that special efforts were being made to reconcile them, and Beshigt'ashlian was writing his song "We are Brothers." Long after the recognition of the Catholics and Protestants

as separate "millet's" by the Turkish government, the fires still smouldered and were reflected in the literature of the times.

If history was repeating itself, it was not because there was a conscious effort to recreate the French Renaissance on Eastern soil but rather because there are certain fundamental elements and problems characteristic of any cultural regeneration. Language, literature, the arts, schools, religion, and outlook on life are all part of the total picture. They contribute to and are affected by the general movement irrespective of time and place. Contact with the outside world at the crucial moment puts the forces in motion which bring about a revolutionary transformation.

The problems of the Armenian Renaissance had arisen from the conditions under which the Armenians were living. The needs were native. Certain types of remedies were necessary. A movement was already afoot toward the meeting of those needs. The prestige of France and the widespread contact with that country led the young Armenians to reenforce and even to revolutionize that movement by injecting French elements into it. Anything and everything which suited their purpose was taken over, adapted, and applied to the local situation. What eventually emerged was a blending of the Armenian and French spirits. In spite of criticisms, in spite of the cognizance of the excesses which resulted, and in spite of the growing competition of English and German cultures, the Western Armenians have continued to be schooled in French art and thought to the present day.

With few exceptions, the Armenian man of letters has not chosen the ivory tower as his abode. Very much conscious of and sharing in the fate of his compatriots, he has wished to do something which would give more than momentary pleasure to the senses. He has sung his nation's sorrows and joys. He has translated religious and scientific books for the spiritual and physical well-being of his people.

He has shed bitter or compassionate tears over their shortcomings. The attitude of the man of the nineteenth-century Renaissance is the same in this respect as the attitude of his forefathers. A patriot whose primary aim was the improvement of his people could not practice "l'art pour l'art." He was not only a man of letters but also a man of action. If he was able to produce a work of art as he worked for a greater goal, he was happy, but if he could not, he was willing to sacrifice aesthetic considerations to the more immediate needs of his people.

The Western Armenian Renaissance was making good progress and was still young when its flame lost its brilliance and was completely extinguished in Turkey by the pogroms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Those men of letters and intellectuals who escaped managed to keep it alive outside their homeland until a new generation arose to take it from them and to carry on the endless struggle for self-preservation.

No one can tell the future course of Western Armenian literature. With most of the Armenians of Turkey scattered to the four corners of the earth, it seems highly unlikely that much genuine Armenian literature will be created before they are assimilated by the populations of the countries which have given them hospitality. Conditions in Turkey are even more unfavorable to the creation of Armenian literature than they were seventy-five years ago. The only hope of development seems to lie in the Syria-Lebanon area, where nearly 200,000 Armenians enjoy considerable freedom, and where they have many schools and cultural centers. Only time will tell to what extent literature will flourish there, and what its nature will be. Although the English influence is more perceptible now than it was half a century ago, French influence is still very strong among the younger, as well as the older writers.

Armenians have not always been receivers. In proportion to their numbers, they have often made great contributions

in the economic, political, military, and cultural fields. Egypt, Persia, Russia, Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, India, and above all Turkey have benefited from the talents of Armenians individually and collectively. Byzantium was at the height of its glory when Armenians were wearing the imperial crown. Through their ambition, diligence, and love of learning, they have achieved a commendable position in the professional and business fields in spite of the unfavorable circumstances under which they have always been obliged to begin. Wherever the Armenian genius has found freedom, it has shown itself capable of the highest achievement. What would have been the result if the Armenian character had been less individualistic so that through united action a much stronger nation could have been forged? What would have been the character of the Armenian political movement in the nineteenth century if the leaders of this impulsive, fiery nation had undergone the English influence, rather than the French? What would have been the nature of the whole Renaissance under these circumstances? These are unanswerable questions, but they deal with the most fundamental aspects of the life and destiny of Armenians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL WORKS ON ARMENIA

A. HISTORIES AND GEOGRAPHIES

- Adont's (Adontz), N. *Histoire d'Arménie, les origines, du X^e siècle au VI^e* (Av. J.C.). Paris, Publication de l'Union Générale Arménienne de Bienfaisance, Fonds Melkonian, 1946.
- . *Historical Studies*. Paris, A. Ghougasian, 1948.
- Alboyajian, A. (Alboyadjian, A.). *The Boundaries of Historical Armenia*. Cairo, Armenian National Fund, 1950.
- Aslan, K. *Etudes historiques sur le peuple arménien*. Nouvelle édition. Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1928.
- Balasanian, S. *History of the Armenian People*. Constantinople, H. Asadurian and Sons, 1922.
- Bliss, E. M. *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*. Boston, H. L. Hastings, 1896.
- Boghossian, H. *The Geography of Armenia*. Paris, 1952.
- Dolens, N. et A. Khatch. *Histoire des anciens Arméniens*. Genève, Union des Etudiants Arméniens de l'Europe, 1907.
- Grousset, R. *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*. Paris, Payot, 1947.
- Kherumian, R. *Les Arméniens, race—origines ethno-raciales*. Paris, Dépositaires, Vigot Frères, 1941.
- Krimittel (Krikor Minas T'ellalian). *Histoire arméno-européenne*. Paris, 1943.
- Lazian, K. *Armenia and the Armenian Question According to Treaties*. Cairo, Husaper, 1942.
- Léart, M. (Zohrab, K.). *La Question arménienne à la lumière des documents*. Paris, Augustin Challamel, 1913.
- Leo (Papakhianian, A.). *History of the Armenian People*. Vol. I, Tiflis, K. H. Der Margosian, 1917. Vol. III, Erevan, Academy of Sciences of the Armenian S. S. R., 1946.

- Lynch, H. F. B. *Armenia, Travels and Studies*. Vol. II, *The Turkish Provinces*. New York and Bombay, Longmans, Green, 1901.
- Macler, F. *Autour de l'Arménie*. Paris, Librairie E. Nourry, 1917.
- . *La Nation arménienne, son passé, ses malheurs*. Paris, Librairie Fischbacher, 1923.
- Manantian, H. *Critical Study of the History of the Armenian People*. Vol. I, Erevan, Armenian National Publication, 1944.
- Vol. III, Erevan, Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian S. S. R., 1952.
- . *Feudalism in Ancient Armenia*. Erevan, (Melkonian Fund Publication), 1934.
- Morgan, J. de. *The History of the Armenian People*. Translated from French by E. F. Barry, Boston, Hairenik' Association, (Published in French, Paris, 1918).
- Nersessian, S. Der. *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945.
- P'asdermajian, H. (P'asdermadjian). *Histoire de l'Arménie depuis les origines jusqu'au traité de Lauzanne*. Paris, Librairie Orientale H. Samuelian, 1949.
- Plutarch. *Lives*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin. Vols. 1 and 2, London, William Heinemann, 1916.
- Sarkissian, A. O. *History of the Armenian Question to 1885*. University of Illinois Bulletin XXXV, Urbana, 1938.
- Varantian, M. *L'Arménie et la question arménienne*. Laval, Imprimerie Moderne G. Kavanaugh et Cie. (no date on title page but "Préface" dated 1917.)
- . *The Origins of the Armenian Movement*. 2 vols. Genève, published by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Vol. I, 1912, Vol. II, 1913.
- Xenophon. *Anabasis*, with an English translation by Carleton L. Brownson. Vol. 3, London, William Heinemann, 1922.
- . *Cyropaedia*, with an English translation by Walter Miller. Vols. 1 and 2, William Heinemann, 1914.

B. CULTURAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL

- Alboyajian, A. *History of the Armenian School*. Vol. I, Publication of the Armenian Teachers' Association of Cairo, 1946.

- . *History of Armenian Emigration*. Vol. I, Cairo, Sahag-Mesrob, 1942, Vol. II, Cairo, New Star, 1955.
- The Armenian National Constitution*. Beirut, Hraztan, 1931.
- Azadian, T. *History of the Esaian School, Fifty-Year Commemorative*. Istanbul, V. Der Nersesian and Sons, 1945.
- Chobanian, A. (Tchobanian). *La Nation arménienne et son oeuvre culturelle*. Paris, Union Nationale Arménienne de France, Comité de défense de la cause de l'Arménie turque, 1945.
- K'echian, P. *History of the Armenian Holy Savior Hospital of Constantinople*. Constantinople, Baghdadian, 1887.
- Leo. *History of Armenian Printing*. Vol. I, revised, Tiflis, "Hermes" Press, 1904.
- Macler, F. *Quatre Conférences sur l'Arménie*. Paris Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1932.
- Movsesian, A. Kh. *Outline History of the Armenian School and Pedagogy*, Erevan, Armenian National Education Publication, 1958.
- Ormanian, M. *The Armenian Church*. Constantinople, V. and H. Der Nersesian, 1912.
- . *History of the Armenian Church*. Vol. II, Constantinople, V. and H. Der Nersesian, 1914, Vol. III, Jerusalem, St. James Monastery Press, 1927.
- Sharasan. *The Armenian Theatre and its Actors in Turkey, 1850-1908*. Constantinople, Arax, 1915.

C. LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

- Ajařian, H. *The Armenian Letters*. Vienna, Mkhit'arist Press, 1928.
- . *History of the Armenian Language*. Part II, Erevan, Armenian National Publication, 1951.
- . *Complete Grammar of the Armenian Language*. Vols. I and II, Erevan, The Academy of Sciences of the Armenian S. S. R., 1955.
- Asadur, H. and Z. Asadur. *Practical Grammar of Modern Armenian*. Book 3, Constantinople, Yazęjjan Press, 1911.
- Feydit, F. *Manuel de langue arménienne*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1948.

- Ghazarian, S. Gh. *Short History of the Armenian Language*. The University of Erevan Publication, 1954.
- Hubschmann, J. H. *Armenische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1895.
- Hubschmann, H. and G. Brockelmann. *A Study of Borrowed Words in Armenian*. Translated into Armenian by Fr. H. Dashian, Vienna, Mkhitarist Press, 1894.
- Meillet, A. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. Seconde édition entièrement remaniée, Vienne, Imprimerie des pp. Mekhitaristes, 1936.
- . and M. Cohen. *Les Langues du monde*. Nouvelle édition. Paris, Centre National de la recherche scientifique, 1952.

D. BIOGRAPHIES

- Alboyajian, A. *Krikor Zohrab*. Constantinople, V. and H. Der Nersesian, 1919.
- Asadur, H. *Silhouettes*. Constantinople, G. K'eshishan Son, 1921.
- Chobanian, A. *Profiles*. Paris, Armenian Educational Foundation, Vol. I, 1924, Vol. II, 1929.
- Ek'serjian, P. *Comprehensive Biography of Bedros Turian*. Constantinople, N. D. Aramian, 1893.
- Fenerjian, K. *Arshag Chobanian*. Paris, Central Committee for the Celebration of the Golden Literary Jubilee of A. Chobanian, 1938.
- Mezbourian, A. *Médecins arméniens et d'origine arménienne*. Vol. I (1688-1864), Istanbul, 1950.
- Mrmrian, H. K. *The Nineteenth Century and Hovhannes Dero-yent's of Brusa*. Constantinople, Zartarian Bros. 1908.
- T'orkomian, V. *Doctor Servichen*. Vienna, Mkhitarist Press, 1893.
- Yeremian, S. *National Figures, Armenian Writers*. 10 vols. Venice, St. Lazarus, 1913-1933.

E. LITERARY HISTORIES

- Apeghian, M. *History of Old Armenian Literature*. Vol. I, second printing, Beirut, Sevan Press, 1955, Vol. II.
- Arp'arian, A. *History of the Nineteenth-Century Literature of the Armenians in Turkey*. Cairo, Husaper, 1944.

Chobanian, A. *Victor Hugo, Chateaubriand et Lamartine dans la littérature arménienne*. Paris, Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1935.

Janashian, M. *History of Modern Armenian Literature (From the Renaissance to the Present)*. Vol. I, Venice, St. Lazarus, 1953.

Oshagan, H. *Panorama of Western Armenian Literature*. 5 vols. Jerusalem, St. James Armenian Monastery Press, 1945-1956.

Torosian, H. (Throssian). *Histoire de la littérature arménienne des origines jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris, (no publisher indicated, but on the back cover the following information is found: Dépositaire Librairie des cinq continents), 1951.

Turian, Y. *History of Armenian Literature*. Jerusalem, St. James Armenian Monastery Press, 1933.

Zaminian, A. *History of Old Armenian Literature*. Vol. I, second printing, Beirut, Huys, 1941.

II. ARMENIAN AUTHORS

Arp'iarian, A. *The Condemned and The Price of a Dream*. Cairo, Vahan Zartarian, 1928.

———. *A Joke*, Cairo, Hapet' Baghdasar, 1929.

———. *The Laughing Girl*. Constantinople, H. Goshgarian, 1928.

———. *Short Stories*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1931.

Avedisian, Y. (Anaïs). *Memoirs*. Paris, 1949.

Beshigt'ashlian, M. *Poems and Plays*. New York, Gochnag Publishing Co., 1917.

Blackwell, A. S. (translator). *Armenian Poems*. Boston, 1917.

Demirjibashian, Y. *Prose, Correspondence, and Poetry*. Paris, Friends of Armenian Writers, 1955.

Gamasaragan, D. *The Teacher's Daughter*. Constantinople, Orient-Masis, 1888.

Garabedian, K. Der (Kegham). *The World of Daron, Tableaus and Short Stories*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1931.

Gürjian, M. (Hrant). *Complete Works, From the Life of Emigrés*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1931.

- Harut'yunian, A. *Prose and Poetry*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1937.
- Harut'yunian, H. (T'lgadint'si). *T'lgadint'si and His Works*. Boston, T'lgadint'si Alumni Assn., 1927.
- Khrimian, M. *Complete Works*. New York, Armenian Educational Foundation, 1929.
- Odian, Y. *Twelve Years Outside Constantinople, 1896-1908*. Constantinople, M. Der Sahagian, 1922.
- Pashalian, L. *Short Stories*. Paris, A. G. B. U. Melkonian Fund.
- Rusinian, N. *Textbook of Philosophy*. Translated from French by S. Et'mek'jian. Constantinople, H. Kavafian, 1879.
- Srmak'eshkhanlian, Y. (Yerukhan). *Legitimate Son and Short Stories*. Orient, 1953.
- Turian, B. *Poems and Plays*. Constantinople, N. J. Aramian, 1893.
- Zartarian, R. *Complete Works, Prose Selections and Folk Tales*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1930.
- Zohrab, K. *Life as It Is*. Constantinople, O. Arzuman, 1893.
- . *A Vanished Generation*. Constantinople, V. S. Purad. 1924.
- . *Silent Griefs*. Constantinople, O. Arzuman, 1911.
- . *Voices of Conscience*. 1909.
- . *Well Known Faces and Short Stories*. Paris, Friends of Martyred Armenian Writers, 1932.
- (Zohrab) Krikor Zohrab's *Short Stories, Literary Essays*. Book II, Zabel Yesayian, Vahan T'ek'eian et al., Constantinople, O. Arzuman, 1913.

III. PERIODICAL LITERATURE

- Abrsam. "Literary Causeries," *Oriental Press*, Feb. vi. 1897.
- Alboyajian, A. "Fiftieth Anniversary of an Educational Event," *Byzantium*, Oct. 24, 1903.
- . "A Fifty-Year Anniversary," *Masis*, Feb. 3, 1901.
- Arp'arian, A. "Daily Life," *Orient*, Feb. 18, 1884; Nov. 29, 1886.
- . "The Forgotten," *Fatherland*, May 15, 1894.
- . "Literary Schools," *Fatherland*, July 12, 1892.
- . "A National Outlook," *Masis*, Sept. 15, 1890.
- Arp'arian, D. "Souvenirs of Editorial Life," *Light*, Jan. 2, 1908.

- Ankeghya, S. (Alboyajian, A.). "The Novel among the Western Armenians," *Flower*, Sept. 25, 1903; Oct. 2, 1903.
- Asadur, H. "Our Life," *Masis*, Aug. 1, 1892.
- Berberian, R. "The Literary Problem," *Masis*, March 10, 1901
- . "New Writers," *Orient*, March 21, 1892.
- Chobanian, A. "Northern Literature," *Flower*, May 20, 1895.
- . "Our Literature," *Masis*, March 10, 1892.
- . "Our Literature," *Orient*, April 18, 1892.
- Demirjibashian, Y. "Confessions to Hrachia," *Literary and Philosophical Movement*, 1883.
- . "The Diary of a Girl," *The Globe*, 1887, No. 3.
- . "The Evolution of Beauty," *Masis*, March 17, 1901.
- . "Mayda," *Literary and Philosophical Movement*, Vol. I, Jan. 1883.
- . "The Mirijanian School of Languages," *The Globe*, 1888, No. 6.
- . "Nouvelle," *Masis*, May 12, 1901.
- . "The Question of Art and Morality," *Masis*, June 17, 1901.
- "Directive for the Reorganization of Parish Schools in Constantinople," *Orient*, Dec. 2, 1886.
- Fndk'lian, K. "Our New Generation Returning from Paris," *Masis*, Dec. 31, 1892.
- . "The Progress of the Western Armenian Vernacular," *Masis*, Sept. 19, 1892.
- Gamsaragan, D. "Alphonse Daudet," *Masis*, May 1, 1893.
- Gülüzyan, S. "The Fair Sex of Adana," *Light*, Nov. 4, 1900.
- Hrad. "Five Years Later," *Light*, Feb. 14, 1898.
- K. H. "A Few Words concerning the New Organization of Armenian Schools," *Orient*, Sept. 12, 1885.
- K'elegian, D. "New Manners," *Masis*, May 15, 1892.
- Kodak. "Short Monologues for the Initiated Who Have Lived in Europe," *Oriental Press*, June 11, 1901.
- Kololian, B. "The Sick Pen," *Masis*, June 5, 1899.
- Lila (P'ap'azian, V.). "The Girl of the Salons," *Light*, Jan. 19, 1902.
- "The Literature of Tomorrow," *Masis*, June 24, 1900.
- Mano. "The Novel," *Oriental Press*, Feb. 1, 1900.
- "Masis Today," *Masis*, May 1, 1888.

- Mercedes. "A Misunderstanding," *Masis*, Aug. 10, 1802.
- Odian, K. "Meditations," (a collection of quotations from Odian), T'evotig, *Almanac*, 1908.
- Odian, Y. "Intimate Life of Odian," (reference is to Krikor Odian), *Masis*, April 3, 1893.
- "Palakashian School for Girls," *Flower*, July 6, 1906.
- P'aPazian, V. "The Décolletés," *Light*, July 3, 1900.
- "Purpose and Direction," *Light*, October, 1897.
- Shahbaz, S. "Our National Constitution," *Baik'ar Annual*, 1957.
- Shamdanjian, M. "Tomorrow's Generation," *Masis*, July 31, 1899.
- . "The Useful in Our Literature," *Masis*, Aug. 28, 1899.
- Sybillé (Zabel Asadur). "Mrs. Dusap in Her Salon," *Light*, Jan. 4, 1903.
- T'evotig. "R. Berberian," *Almanac*, 1908.
- . "Yeghya," *Almanac*, 1908.
- T'oshigian, V. S. "Wrong Education," *Light*, Feb. 16, 1902.
- Ut'üjian, G. "Ashkharhaparian or Kraparian," *Masis*, June 18, 1892.
- . "The Year 1852 and Yesterday," *Masis*, Jan. 1, 1900.
- Vosgan, S. "The Pearl Necklace," (collection of quotations from Vosgan), *Light*, Jan. 1, 1908.
- Zartarian, R. "The Literature of Tomorrow," *Masis*, Dec. 23, 1900.
- Zohrab, K. "Education at the End of the Century," *Orient*, Dec. 11, 1890.
- . "Immoral Literature," *Masis*, Feb. 14, 1892.
- . "The Living Dead," *Masis*, Feb. 6, 1893.
- . "The New Journalism," *Masis*, Aug. 1, 1892.
- . "The Teachers' Conference," *Masis*, Sept. 17, 1892.
- Yesayian, Z. "The Adventures of an Ingénu," *Masis*, Feb. 16, 1908.
- . "The Journalist and the Writer," *Masis*, June 4, 1905.

IV. DICTIONARIES

- Demirjibashian, Y. *French-Armenian Dictionary*. Constantinople, K. Baghadadlian, 1896.
- Nubarian, M. *French-Modern Armenian Dictionary*. Constantinople, K. Baghadadlian, 1892.

270 *French Influence on Western Armenian Renaissance*

Puzantat'si, N. *French-Armenian Dictionary*. Constantinople, A. H. Boyajian, 1884.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ghazigian, A. *New Armenian Bibliography and Encyclopedia of Armenian Life*. Vol. I, Venice, St. Lazarus, 1901-1912.

VI. TURKEY AND THE NEAR EAST

Creasy, Sir E. S. *History of the Ottoman Turks*. New York, Henry Holt, 1878.

Davis, W. S. *A Short History of the Near East From the Foundation of Constantinople (330 A.D. to 1922)*. New York, Macmillan, 1937.

Earle, E. M. *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway*. New York, Macmillan, 1923.

Gibb, E. J. S. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Edited by E. G. Browne, Vols. IV and V, London, Vol. IV, 1905, Vol. V, 1907.

Hidden, A. W. *The Ottoman Dynasty*. New York, Nicholas W. Hidden, 1912.

Marriott, J. A. R. *The Eastern Question, an Historical study in European Diplomacy*. Second edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1918.

Mears, E. G. *Modern Turkey*. New York, Macmillan, 1934.

Morgenthau, H. *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*. New York Doubleday, Page and Co., 1918.

Runciman, S. A. *History of the Crusades*. Cambridge University Press, Vol. I, 1951; Vol. II, 1953.

Toynbee, A. *The Treatment of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire*. London, Causton and Sons, Limited, 1916.

VII. EUROPEAN HISTORY AND INSTITUTIONS

Abbott, W. C. *The Expansion of Europe*. 2 Vols. New York, Henry Holt, 1918.

Hayes, C. J. H. *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*. Vol. II, New York, Macmillan, 1925.

Ketelbey, D. M. *A History of Modern Times from 1789 to the Present Day*. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell, 1929 (?).

VIII. FRENCH HISTORY AND INSTITUTIONS

- Allen, G. H. *The French Revolution*. Vol. IV, *The Terror*. Philadelphia, George Barrie's Sons, 1925.
- Anderson, F. M. *The Constitution and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France*. 1789-1901, Minneapolis, H. W. Wilson, 1904.
- Armand, R. *The Second Republic and Napoleon III*. Translated from the French by E. F. Buckley. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, MCMXXX.
- Blanc, L. *The History of Ten Years, 1830-1840, or France under Louis Philippe*. Translated by W. K. Kelly. Vol. II, Philadelphia, Lea and Blanchard, 1848.
- Bruun, G. *Europe and the French Imperium, 1799-1814*. New York and London, Harper and Brothers, MCMXXXVIII.
- Lavissee, E. *Histoire de France contemporaine*. Vol. V, Paris, 1920-1922.
- Lucas-Dubreton, J. *The Restoration and the July Monarchy*. Translated from the French by E. F. Buckley. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, MCMXXIX.
- Lockwood, H. C. *Constitutional History of France*. Chicago and New York, Rand, McNally, 1890.
- Stephens, H. *A History of the French Revolution*. Vol. II, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.

IX. FRENCH AUTHORS

- Cousin, V. *Du vrai, du beau et du bien*. Paris, Didier et Cie., 18^e ed., 1873.
- Daudet, A. *Fromont Jeune et Risler Aîné*, Paris, G. Charpentier, 1880.
- . *Jack*. Paris, Marron et Flammarion, 1889.
- . *Le Nabab*. Paris, Ernest Flammarion.
- . *Sapho*. Paris, C. Marron et E. Flammarion, 1887.
- Hugo, V. *Les Contemplations*. Paris, Michel Lévy Frères—J. Hetzel—Pagnerre, 1856, New York, Roe Lockwood and Son.
- . *Les Orientales*. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1872.
- Lamartine, A. *Premières Méditations Poétiques*. Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1900.

Maupassant, G. de. *Oeuvres Complètes*. Paris, Louis Conard Libraire-éditeur, MCMXXII.

Zola, E. *L'Assommoir*. Paris, G. Charpentier, 1879.

———. *Germinal, Les Oeuvres Complètes*, Emile Zola, *Les Rougons-Macquart*. Paris, Topographie François Bernouard, 1885 (?).

———. *Nana*. Paris, G. Charpentier, 1881.

———. *La Terre*. Paris, G. Charpentier et Cie., 1887.

X. RUSSIAN AUTHORS

Tolstoi, L. N. *War and Peace*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

APPENDIX

A PARTIAL LIST OF FRENCH WORKS

TRANSLATED INTO ARMENIAN DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

- About, Edmond. *Les Mariages de Paris*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1883.
- . *Le Roi des montagnes*, trans. A. Ghandakhjian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1888.
- Amicis, Edmond de. *Grands coeurs*, trans. Yevp'imē B. Odian. Constantinople, V. Minasian, 1889.
- . *Souvenirs de Paris et de Londres*, trans. Hovhan T'orosian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1896.
- Arlincourt, C. V. P. Vicomte d'. *L'Etrangère*. Constantinople, Arabian Bros., 1856-58.
- Les Assises d'Antioche*, trans. Constable Smpad. Cilicia, 1585.
- Aubert, Charles. *La Marieuse*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 612-648, 1893.
- Barthélemy, Abbé J.-J. *Le Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce*, trans. Kevork and Yetvart Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1843-46.
- Beaupoint de Grandpré, Jules. *Cartouche, roi des voleurs*, trans. K. S. Constantinople (?), H. Karaian, 1889.
- Beaumarchais, P.-A. Caron de. *Le Barbier de Séville*, trans. M. Mamurian. 1861- 68.
- Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, J.-H. *Paul et Virginie*, trans. Kevork and Yetvart Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1860.
- Boileau-Despréaux, N. *L'Art poétique*, trans. H. K. Mrmrian.
- . *Le Lutrin*, trans. M. Nubarian.
- Bossuet, Jacques-Béguier. *Histoire universelle*, trans. M. Karakashian, H. Kat'ērjian, G. Hovnanian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1841.
- . *Oraisons funèbres*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press(?), 1870.

Bourget, Paul. *Le Disciple*, O. Chiff'ë Saraf.

Carraud, Mme Zulma Touranger. *Maurice ou le travail*, trans. S. Harent's. Constantinople, Y. M. Dndesian Press, 1879.

Chateaubriand, F.-R. de. *Atala*, trans. K. Chaprasdian. Constantinople, 1858.

———. *Le Dernier Abencérage* (in Turkish with Armenian letters), trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, before 1860.

Coppée, François. *Le Coupable*, trans. P. M. Bozajian. Constantinople, *Byzantium*, Nos. 111-181, 1897.

Corneille, Pierre. *Polyeucte*, trans. Kevork Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1858.

Cottin, S. R., dame. *Les Histoires des exilés en Sibérie*, trans. Kevork and Yetvart Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Pres (?), 1873.

Daudet, Alphonse. *Jack*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 3603-?, 1896.

Du Boisgobey, Fortuné. *Le Pouce crochu*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 531-597, 1885.

———. *Une Affaire mystériense*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 877-935, 1893.

———. *La Vieillesse de monsieur Lecoq*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 173-327, 1884-85.

Dumas père, Alexandre. *Catherine Howard*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros.

———. *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros.

———. *Fernande*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1528-1617, 1889.

———. *Joseph Balsamo*, trans. G. Yazëjian.

———. *Les Trois Mousquetaires*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros. (?)

———. *Le Vicomte de Bragelonne*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros. (?)

———. *Vingt Ans après*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros. (?)

Dumas fils, Alexandre. *La Dame aux camélias*, trans. H. Ajemian. 1872.

Fénelon, F. de S. de la Mothe-. *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, trans. S. Chakhchakhian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1826.

- . *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, trans. K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhitarist Press (?), 1850.
- . *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, trans. A. Kalfaian. Paris, 1859.
- Feuillet, Octave. *Honneur d'artiste*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1896-1940, 1890.
- . *Un Mariage dans le monde*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1618-1649, 1888.
- . *Monsieur de Camors*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros. (?).
- . *Le Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*, trans. K. Mseirian. Smyrna.
- . *La Morte*, trans. M. T'elian. Constantinople, 1892.
- . *La Veuve*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1362-1382, 1888.
- Feydeau, Ernest. *La Comtesse de Chalis*, trans. L. Pashalian. Constantinople, *Orient-Masis*, 1887.
- Florian, J.-P. Claris de. *Deux Billets*, trans. S. Vosgan. Paris, *Occident*, 1859.
- . *Galatée*, trans. N. Nurijan. Constantinople, 1863.
- . *Jeannot et Colin*, trans. S. Vosgan. Paris, *Orient*, 1855.
- . *Numa Pompilius* trans, K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhitarist Press (?), 1853.
- Gaboriau, Emile. *L'Affaire Lerouge*, trans. B. Ayruni. Constantinople, S. Deovlet'jian, 1885 (?).
- . *La Corde au cou*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 290-354, 1892-93.
- . *Le Dossier numéro 113*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 192-291, 1892.
- . *La Vie infernale*. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1898.
- Garnier, Joseph. *Premières Notions d'économie politique, sociale, ou industrielle*, trans. G. S. Ut'üjian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1873.
- Gautier, Théophile. *La Fausse conversion*, trans. V. K'üpejian. Smyrna, Mamurian Press, 1895.
- Genlis, Mme Stéphanie-Félicité de. *Bélisaire*, trans. K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mekhitarist Press (?), 1859.
- George, Dr. Hector. *Leçons élémentaires d'hygiène*, trans. S. Et'mek'jian. Constantinople, H. Kavafian, 1876.

- Gratry, le P. A.-J.-A. *La Philosophie du credo*. Venice, Mkhitarist Press, 1880-81.
- Gros, Jules. *Un Volcan dans les glaces*. Constantinople, Flower, Nos. 11-2, 1897.
- Halévy, Ludovic. *L'Abbé Constantin*, trans. Yevp'imē Odian. Constantinople, Baghdadian Press, 1885.
- Hugo, Victor. *Angelo*. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1863.
- . *Claude Gueux*, trans. Khachig Odian. Constantinople, Aramian, 1872.
- . *Le Dernier jour d'un condamné*, trans. P. Maghak'ian. Constantinople, Hamazkayin Press, 1863.
- . *Le Dernier jour d'un condamné*. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1873.
- . *Lucrece Borgia*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1862.
- . *Les Misérables*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1868 (?). Second printing, 1885-89.
- . *Notre-Dame de Paris*, Vol. I, trans. D. T'ertzian. Constantinople, D. T'ertzian, 1869.
- . *Notre-Dame de Paris*, trans. M. Nubarian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1871-72.
- . *Le Roi s'amuse*, trans. A. K. M. Constantinople, D. K. P'ap'azian, 1888.
- . *Ruy Blas*, trans. N. Rusinian. Constantinople, Kavafian Press, 1873.
- Jaccoliot, Louis. *Le Crime du moulin d'Uxor*. Constantinople, Orient, Nos. 2766-2815, 1893.
- . *Vengeance de forçats*. Constantinople, Orient, Nos. 2816-2846, 1893.
- Laboulaye, Dr. E.-R. Lefebvre de. *Paris en Amérique*, trans. K. Mserian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1876.
- Lafargue, Paul. *Le Droit à la paresse*, trans. editors of *Hnchag*. Socialist Library, Hnchagian Publications No. 8, Athens, Armenian Free Press, 1893.
- La Fontaine, Jean de. *Fables*, trans. M. Nubarian.
- Lamartine, Alphonse de. *Graziella*, trans. S. G. E. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1872. Second printing, 1873. Third printing, 1874.
- . *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses* (published under

- the title of *Les harmonies de Lamartine*), trans. Corène V. Calfa [K. Kalfaian]. Paris, Typographie arménienne, 1859.
- . *Premières Méditations poétiques*, trans. S. G. Kant'arian. Venice Mkhitarist Press, 1876.
- . *Raphaël*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1867.
- Lamennais, Félicité-R. de. *Le Livre du peuple*, trans. M. Ajemian. Constantinople, K'irishjian and Co., 1870.
- . *Paroles d'un croyant*, trans. H. H. Berberian. Constantinople, H. P'ap'azian, 1871.
- Le Faure, Amédée. *Histoire de la guerre d'Orient*. 1897.
- Legouvé, Ernest. *Histoire morale des femmes*, trans. T. Melikzariant's. Constantinople, N. G. Berberian, 1889.
- Lermine, Jules. *Le Fils de Monte-Cristo*, Vol. I, trans. S. H. Abahuni. Constantinople, Typesetters' Union Press, 1885. Vols. II and III, trans. S. Tavit'ian. Constantinople, *Orient-Masis*, 1888.
- . *Le Fils de Monte-Cristo*, trans. B. Adruni Vol. I, Constantinople, Typesetters' Union Press, 1888. Vols. II-VI, Constantinople, N. Berberian, 1888.
- . *Les Loups de Paris*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 2847-? 1893.
- Le Sage, Alain R. *Gil Blas*, trans. S. G. Chalekhian. Constantinople, Aramian, 1867.
- Malot, Hector. *En Famille*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 3262-? 1895.
- . *Sans Famille*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, G. S. Ut'ujian, 1884.
- Marlès, J. Lacroix de. *Anna ou la piété filiale*, trans. S. Kurkenian. Venice, Mkhitarist Press, 1882.
- Martin, L.-Aimé. *De l'Education des mères de famille*, Vol. I, trans. A. M. Karakashian. Constantinople, K'irishjian and Co., 1870. Vol. II, trans. Simon Kap'amajian. Constantinople, Ashjian Press, 1885.
- Mary, Jules. *Les Deux Amours de Thérèse*, trans. L. Pashalian. Constantinople, *Orient-Masis*, 1887.
- . *Deux Innocents*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 2247-2382, 1891.

- . *Diane-la-Pâle*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 3081-2, 1894.
- . *La Fée Printemps*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 649-745, 1893-94.
- . *Paradis perdu*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1746-1895, 1889-90.
- . *Roger-la-Honte*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 489-610, 1893.
- Massillon, Jean-Baptiste. *Petit Carême*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1865.
- Matthey, A. *Cherchez la femme*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 545-640, 1893.
- Maupassant, Guy de. *Fort comme la mort*, trans. A. Chobanian, Constantinople, *Orient*. Nos. 2182-2246, 1891.
- Mérimée, Prosper. *Colomba*, trans. K. Jelalian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1863.
- Michelet, Jules. *L'Amour*, trans. A. Muradian. Constantinople, B. Jezvejian, 1871.
- Mircourt, Eugène de. *Les Confessions de Marion de Lorme*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1876-78.
- Molière. *L'Amour médecin*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1855. Second printing, 1881.
- . *L'Avare*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1854. Second printing, 1881.
- . *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, trans. H. Lalaian. Constantinople, *Theatre*, Book I.
- . *La Jalousie du Barbouillé*, trans. D. Karakashian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1864.
- . *Le Malade imaginaire*, trans. A. K. Masenian. Constantinople, Jiviligian Press, 1891.
- . *Le Mariage forcé*. Constantinople, D. K. P'ap'azian, 1892.
- . *Le Médecin malgré lui*, trans. D. H. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1854. Second printing, 1882.
- . *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*. Constantinople, Oriental Press, 1861.
- . *Le Tartuffe*, trans. A. G. Dedeian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1874.
- Monod, Adolphe. *Lucile ou la lecture de la Bible*. Constantinople, A. Churchill, 1854.

- Montalembert, C.-R.F. *Histoire de sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie*, trans. D. Yaghlek'jian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1866.
- Montépin, Xavier de. *Le Secret du Titan*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 1306-1416, 1895-96.
- . *Simone et Marie*, trans. M. Chobanian. Constantinople, 1884-1889.
- . *Les Vengeurs*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 1385-? 1896.
- Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, baron de. *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et sur leur décadence*, trans. H. K. Mmrian.
- Moret, Eugène. *Confessions d'une jolie femme*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 3342-? 1895.
- Musset, Alfred de. *Les Confessions d'un enfant du siècle*, Vol. I, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1873. Second printing ? Third printing, 1875.
- . *Poésies nouvelles*, trans. B. K. T'ertzian. Smyrna, Msrian Press, 1878 (?).
- Napoléon III. *La Vie de Jules César*, Vol. I, trans. A. Jarian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1867.
- Noir, Louis. *L'Auberge maudite*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1650-1745, 1889.
- Ohnet, Georges. *Le Maître des forges*, trans. P. Bozajian. Constantinople, 1886 (?).
- Pascal, Blaise. *Pensées*, trans. H. Deroyent's. Constantinople, 1840.
- Pétis de la Croix père, François. *Histoire du grand Genghiscan*, trans. A. M. Shehrimanian. Trieste, Mkhit'arist Press, 1788.
- Ponson du Terrail, P.-A. *Rocambole*, Vol. I, trans. S.-B. Arabajian. Constantinople, M. P'ap'azian, 1891.
- . *Le serment des hommes rouges*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1882.
- Pont-Jest, Louis-René de. *Le Fleuve des perles*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 3212-? 1894.
- . *Le Mort qui se tue*, trans. O. Parseghian.
- Pradel, Georges. *L'Amazone bleue*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 936-1103, 1894-95.
- . *La Fille du régicide*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 1104-1219, 1895.

- Pressensé, E. de. *Conférence sur le concile écumenique du Vatican et sur la Rome actuelle*, trans. H. Shishmanian. Constantinople, 1870.
- Prévost, abbé A.-F. *Manon Lescaut*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1872.
- Racine, Jean. *Athalie*, trans. K. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?).
- . *Athalie*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1869.
- . *Britannicus*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1869.
- . *Iphigénie*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1869.
- . *Mithridate*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1869.
- . *Phèdre*, trans. K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1861.
- . *Les Plaideurs*, trans. M. Nubarian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros., 1868.
- Racine, Louis. *La Religion*, trans. M. Karakashian. Vienna, Mkhit'arist Press, 1842.
- . *La Religion*, trans. K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1872.
- Regnauld de Prébois, Mme Adèle. *Le Moulin de l'hermitage*, trans. M. Mamurian. Constantinople, R. H. K'urk'jian, 1862.
- Richebourg, Emile. *Cendrillon*, trans. Yervant. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 2434-2649, 1892.
- . *L'Idiote*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1961-2181, 1890-91.
- Richebourg, Emile and E. de Lyden. *Les Amoureuses de Paris*, trans. Y. Srmak'eshkhanlian. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 2620-2765, 1892-93.
- Rollin, Charles. *Histoire ancienne*, trans. K. and Y. Hürmüz. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press (?), 1825-29.
- . *Histoire romaine*, trans. V. Asgerian and M. Chakhchakhian. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press, 1816.
- Roman du chevalier Paris et de la belle Vienne*, trans. Fr. Hovhan. Marseilles, 1585.

- Sand, George. *Mademoiselle de la Quintinie*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros(?).
- Sandeau, Jules. *Marianna*. Constantinople, *Fatherland*, Nos. 39-97, 1891.
- Sardou, Victorien. *Nos Intimes*, trans. L. Pashalian. Constantinople, *Masis*, Nos. 3912-3917, 1888.
- Sue, Eugène. *La Famille Jouffroy*, trans. D. Gamsaragan. Constantinople, *Light*, 1884.
- . *Le Juif errant*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, N. Berberian and D. S. Deovlet'jian, 1885.
- . *Mathilde*, trans. K. Chilingirian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros(?).
- . *Les Mystères de Paris*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros. (?)
- Tessereau, Dr. Auguste. *Cours d'hygiène*, trans. M. P. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, T. Divit'jian, 1864.
- Tissandier, Gaston. *Les héros du travail*, trans. G. H. Karagülian. Constantinople, N. G. Berberian and S. Deovlet'jian, 1886.
- Topin, Marius J. F. *L'Homme au masque de fer*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1870.
- Verne, Jules. *L'Ecole des Robinsons*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 2383-2430, 1892.
- . *Les Enfants du capitaine Grant*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 328-529, 1885.
- . *Les Indes noires*, trans. L. Pashalian. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 1477-1527, 1888-89.
- . *L'Isle mystérieuse*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros(?).
- . *Mathias Sandorf*. Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 592-721, 1885-86.
- . *Le Tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*, trans. M. Mamurian. Smyrna, Dedeian Bros(?).
- . *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*, trans. G. S. Ut'ujian(?). Constantinople, *Orient*, Nos. 765-890, 1886.
- Voltaire, F.-M. A. de. *Alzire*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhitarist Press(?), 1869.
- . *Le Blanc et le noir*, trans. M. Mamurian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1855(?).

- . *Jeannot et Colin*, trans. M. Mamurian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1855.
- . *Mérope*, trans. A. Pakraduni. Venice, Mkhit'arist Press(?), 1869.
- . *Micromégas*, trans. M. Mamurian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1856.
- . *La Mort de César*, trans. H. N. Shamrian. Calcutta, 1812.
- . *Zadig*, trans. M. Mamurian. Constantinople, *Masis*, 1854.

Index

A

- Abdul-Aziz, 90, 145
- Abdul-Hamid, 40, 92, 96, 110, 112, 132, 144 ff., 218, 219, 220
- Abdul-Mejid, 82, 90, 91, 145, 167
- Achaemenian, 31
- Africa, 34
- Agathangelus (See "Akat'ankeghos")
- "Age of Enlightenment," 68
- Aghapapian School, 70
- Aghapegian, 114
- Aghat'on, M., 113, 167
- Aght'amar, 83
- Aimé-Martin, 106
- Ajemian, M., 113, 114, 126, 202
- Akat'ankeghos, 73, 75
- Albania, 42
- Albert, P., 246
- Alexander (Czar), 88
- Alexander (the Great), 28, 29, 46
- Alexandria, 47
- Alishan, Fr. Ghevont, 99, 110, 112, 114, 126, 128, 131, 202, 203, 207, 214
- Alsatian, 106
- Amanus Mountains, 26
- American, 166
- American Board of Foreign Missions, 151
- Amira, 106, 115, 116, 139, 165
- Amphicrates, 30
- Amsterdam, 60
- Anais, 177, 178, 179, 187, 190, 220, 226
- Anglo-American, 169, 180
- Antioch, 29, 41, 54, 57
- Antiochus the Great, 29
- Apkar, 65
- Arabic, 60, 151, 153
- Arabs, 27, 39, 49, 52, 58, 255
- Aramaic, 28, 37
- Aramian School, 174
- Araratian Association, 165, 215
- Ardashad (See "Artaxiata")
- Ardashes (See "Artaxias")
- Ardashesian, 32
- Ardavazt (See "Artavasdes")
- Ardzruni, 126
- Armavir, 35
- Armenagan Party, 132
- Armenian alphabet, 28, 33, 41, 43, 44, 51, 150, 151
- Armenian Catholics, 40, 58, 59, 72, 86, 101, 151, 166, 221, 258
- Armenian Church, 38, 41, 42, 46, 56, 57, 61, 72, 73, 83, 84, 101, 103, 116, 129, 163, 258
- Armenian Cilicia, 54
- Armenian classics, 73, 74
- Armenian clergy, 39, 40, 47, 56, 57, 61, 64, 65, 68, 70, 71, 123, 152, 163
- Armenian education, 42, 51, 63, 64, 68, 69, 103, 105, 106, 109, 111, 112, 143, 144, 162 ff., 170 ff., 173
- Armenian emperors, 46
- Armenian Empire, 29
- Armenian feudalism, 54 ff.
- Armenian history, 64, 73
- Armenian language, 28, 35, 42, 48 ff., 52, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 84, 101 ff., 105 ff., 110, 137 ff., 142, 150 ff., 162, 176, 189, 195, 198, 201, 211, 250, 254, 256, 258, 259
- Armenian literature, 28, 45 ff., 50 ff., 55, 68, 69, 72, 74, 98, 99, 113, 142, 143, 151, 154, 157, 195 ff., 203, 212, 214 ff., 218 ff., 231, 243, 244, 247, 256, 259, 260
- Armenian manners, 50, 175 ff., 199, 243

- Armenian merchants, 69, 70
 Armenian movement, 115 ff., 203
 Armenian National Constitution, 102, 104 ff., 117, 120 ff., 129, 131, 136, 139, 146, 163, 164, 204
 Armenian National Hospital, 120, 123, 215, 218, 221
 Armenian paganism, 51
 Armenian Plateau, 26, 27, 256
 Armenian press, 133, 136 ff., 152, 154, 157, 175, 214 ff., 246
 Armenian printing, 65, 69
 "Armenian Question," 98, 125, 134, 197
 Armenian Renaissance, 96 ff., 137, 147, 183, 196, 197, 215, 220, 240, 258 ff.
 Armenian Revolutionary Federation, 132
 Armenian schools (See "Armenian education")
 Armenian studies, 63
 Armenian theatre, 74, 100, 157, 159, 160, 187, 196, 198 ff., 212, 216
 Armeno-Cilicians, 55
 Armens, 27 ff., 35, 36, 49
 Arp'arian, A., 126, 140, 145, 155, 170, 171, 179, 190, 191, 214, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222 ff., 226, 236, 237, 242, 243, 246
 Arp'arian, D., 143
 Arsacid, 32, 27, 42
 Arshaguni, 33
 Art for art's sake, 250, 260
 Artavasdes, 30
 Artaxias, 28, 29
 Artaxiata, 36
 "Artist Generation," 219, 237
 Aryan, 27
 Asadur, H., 106, 107, 156, 167, 187, 222
 Ashkharhapar, 75, 98, 101, 103, 107, 152, 153, 158, 160, 169, 189
 Ashkharhapanian, 153, 154
 Ashkhenian School, 184
 Ashoughs, 55
 Asia, 28, 34, 38
 Asia Minor, 26 ff., 31, 33, 34, 37, 49, 70, 256
 Asian Association, 165
 Asiatic, 27, 29, 33, 38, 64, 70, 182, 256
 Assyria, 35
 Assyro-Babylonian, 32
 Astrakhan, 63, 70
 Athens, 38, 41
 Augsburg, War of the League of, 62
 Australian, 142
 Austria, 63
 Avedik' (Patriarch), 68
 Aydenian, Fr., 73, 75, 153
 Aynt'ab, 166
 Ayvazovski, 114
- B
- Baccalauréat ès sciences [et] ès lettres, 169
 Badvelis, 162
 Bagratid, 47, 52
 Baldwin I, 53
 Baldwin II, 53
 Balian, G., 106
 Balian, H., 187
 Balian, Harut'yun, 105, 114
 Balian, N., 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 109, 114, 117, 138, 153, 164, 187
 Balt'azarian, 145
 Balzac, 241, 244
 Bardizban, 96, 114, 164
 Baronian, H., 114, 147, 215, 226
 Bartholomew, 37
 Barudji Bashi, 82
 Baudelaire, 216, 244, 252, 253
 Belgian Revolution, 89
 Belgium, 89
 Belgrade, 87
 Béranger, 95, 96, 108, 196, 204, 205
 Berberian, R., 111, 114, 140, 166, 169, 170, 249
 Berberian School, 111-112, 169, 202
 Bernard, Claude, 196
 Bernhardt, Sarah, 182
 Beshigt'ashlian, M., 99 ff., 114, 126, 128, 199, 200, 202, 204 ff., 254, 258
 Beyoghlu, 168
 Bezjian, Harut'yun Amira, 82, 163
 (See also "Kazaz Art'in")
 Bible, 44, 105, 135, 152, 200, 203
 Bismarck, 182
 Black Sea, 49
 Blanc, Louis, 95, 96

Boghos Bey, 211
 Boileau, N., 159
 Boisgobey, 157
 Bosphorus, 35, 181, 257
 British, 62, 131, 148, 182
 Brunetière, 196
 Bucharest, 89
 Bulgaria, 131, 261
 Bulgarian, 146
 Byzantine, 46, 54, 85
 Byzantine Empire, 46, 48, 53
 Byzantines, 39, 49
 Byzantium, 38, 39, 47, 49, 52, 221

C

Caesarea, 37, 38
 Calcutta, 136
 Calixtus III, 66
 "Capitulations," 87
 Cappadocia, 26, 30, 37, 39, 53
 Capuchins, 60, 66
 Carduchian Mountains, 26
 Caspian Sea, 26, 35
 Castile, 56
 Catholic Church, 56 ff., 63, 65
 Catholic "millet," 86
 Catholic education, 58 ff.
 Catholic schools, (See "Catholic education")
 Catholicism, 57, 58, 70 ff., 86, 144, 202
 Catholicos Hagop (See "Hagop (Catholicos)")
 Catholicos Nerses (See "Nerses (Catholicos)")
 Catholicos Sahag (See "Sahag (Catholicos)")
 Caucasus, 49, 50, 63
 Cavour, 108
 Censorship, 143, 144, 146, 149, 201, 212, 215, 218
 Central Asia, 35
 Chamchian, 73, 125, 127, 203
 Charitable Association, 165
 Charles V, 86
 Chateaubriand, 100, 126, 202, 241
 Cheraz, M., 114, 141, 153, 220
 Chilingirian, K., 110, 111, 155, 156
 Chinese, 142
 Chobanian, A., 96, 111, 141, 222, 244 ff.
 Christ, 37

Christendom, 42, 53
 Christian, 37, 39, 40, 44, 51, 57, 97, 130, 195, 198, 200, 256
 Christianity, 34, 36 ff., 44, 46, 49, 116, 196
 Christians, 56, 57, 79, 80, 81, 83, 88, 92, 256
 Cicero, 31, 36
 Cilicia, 31, 53, 54, 56 ff.
 Cilician Association, 165
 Cilician Kingdom, 53, 56, 57, 64, 150
 Civil Council, 116, 120, 164 (See also "Supreme Council")
 Classical Armenian, 35, 45, 48, 72, 74, 98, 107, 150
 Classicism, 196
 Cleopatra, 30
 Collège de France, 96, 103, 138, 147
 Collège Louis-le-Grand, 60
 Collegium Urbanum, 58
 Congress of Berlin, 131
 Congress of Vienna, 89
 Constable Smpad, 66
 Constantinople, 60, 61, 65 ff., 71, 73, 74, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 95, 97, 103 ff., 111, 112, 116, 117, 121, 123, 125, 129, 132, 137, 138, 140, 144, 145, 147, 149, 151, 152, 155, 156, 159, 162 ff., 169, 170, 173, 175, 176, 179, 180, 184, 190, 195, 198, 199, 202, 204, 218, 220, 248 ff.
 Coppé, F., 157
 Cornille, P., 100, 157
 Courtenay, 54
 Cousin, V., 95, 96, 108
 Crimean War, 93
 Crusades, 197
 Cyrus River (Gur), 26

D

Dadian, Afak'el Bey, 188
 Dadian, Art'in P'asha, 176
 Dadian, Hovhannes, 188
 Dadian, K., 105, 114, 164
 Danish, 247
 Darius I, 26
 Daudet, A., 157, 216, 227, 228, 231, 235 ff., 244

- Declaration of the Rights of Man, 88, 118, 119, 133
 "Décolleté" literature, 189, (See also "Morality in literature")
 Delacroix, 196
 Demirjibashian, Y., 141, 145, 157, 178, 179, 196, 220, 223, 240, 242, 251, 258
 Dereh begs, 80, 82
 Deroyent's, Badveli, 99, 101, 103, 138, 167, 173
 Dikran (See "Tigranes")
 Dikranagerd (See "Tigranocerta")
 Dionisus, 36
 Diophysitic, 83
 Dominican, 57, 58
 Dreyfus, 238
 Drtad, 34, 36
 Dumas, A. fils, 201, 216
 Dumas, A. père, 157, 201
 Düsap, Srpuihi, 99, 167, 184, 188, 189, 212, 242, 243, 254
 Dusseldorf, 62
 Dutch, 60
 Duval, A., 213
 Düzian family, 92, 163, 164, 198
 Düzian, Krikor, 82
 Düzian, Sarkis, 82
 Düzoghlu (See "Düzian")
 Dzerent's, 100, 114, 126, 140, 208
- E
- Eastern Armenia, 57, 58
 Easterners, 60
 Echmiadzin, 61, 69, 73, 158
 Ecole des douze jeunes Arméniens, 60
 Ecole des langues orientales vivantes, 96, 158
 Economic Council, 122, 123
 Edessa, 37, 53 ff.
 Educational Association, 115
 Educational associations, 144, 165, 166
 Educational Council, 102, 104, 120, 164, 166
 Egypt, 30, 88, 219, 261
 Egyptians, 56
 England, 89, 91, 93, 105, 131, 247, 257,
 English, 60, 70, 74, 148, 155, 168 ff., 173, 174, 181, 227, 247, 260, 261
 "Enlightened," 103, 116
 Erevan, 135
 "Ermeni millet'i," 122
 Esnafs, 165
 Eternal City (See "Rome")
 Euphrates River, 26, 29, 33
 Europe, 39, 53, 56, 68, 70, 74, 87 ff., 94, 102, 132, 140, 164, 187, 250
 European, 26, 83, 94, 107, 108, 124, 141, 153, 164, 167, 173, 180, 181, 185, 186, 205, 208, 211, 219, 226, 227, 241, 245, 246, 250
 European financial interests, 181 ff.
 Europeanization, 91, 190
 "Europeanized Asiatics," 190
- F
- Fénelon, 157
 Ferry, J., 96
 Feuillet, O., 157
 First Crusade, 54
 Flammarion, 142
 Flaubert, G., 216, 225, 227, 244, 246
 Florival, 96
 Fndk'lian, K., 152
 France, 54, 60, 61, 68, 87, 89, 93, 94, 96, 102, 106, 109, 111, 112, 122, 140, 141, 147, 164, 166, 167, 175, 182, 189, 190, 201, 203, 257, 258, 259
 Francis I, 86
 Franciscan, 57
 Franks, 55, 59, 66, 152
 French, 55, 56, 60, 66, 70, 74, 82, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 99, 100, 102 ff., 108, 109, 111 ff., 116, 118, 121, 124, 130, 140, 142, 143, 148, 151, 154, 155, 157 ff., 167 ff., 179 ff., 185, 187, 189, 190, 196, 200, 202 ff., 207, 211, 213, 214, 220, 226, 227, 233, 236, 237, 245, 247, 257 ff., 260, 261
 French literature, 68, 90, 109, 111, 142, 171, 172, 176, 195, 204, 216, 252, 257, 258
 French Revolution, 89, 109, 203
 French schools, 60
 Froebelian system, 74

G

- Galata, 90
 Gambetta, 96, 108
 Gamsaragan, D., 214, 217, 222, 224, 238, 246
 Garabedian, Kegham Der, 248
 Garibaldi, 97, 126
 Garin, 85, 132, 166, 169, 170
 Georgia, 42
 Georgian, 41, 63
 German, 74, 148, 155, 159, 171, 173, 180, 182, 183, 247, 258, 259
 German Emperor, 56, 182
 Germany, 63, 91, 183, 247, 258
 Giaurs, 80
 Goethe, 20
 Golden Age, 45, 97, 195
 Golod (Patriarch), 69
 Goncourts, 216, 244
 Goryun, 73, 75
 Gospel, 41
 Gounod, 189
 Graeco-Roman, 34, 98
 Great Assasin, 132
 Greater Armenia, 26, 35
 Greece, 28, 37, 131
 Greek, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 39 ff., 45 ff., 52, 74, 81 ff., 104, 111, 123, 151, 167, 195, 199, 206
 "Greek School," 47, 48
 Greeks, 27 ff., 38, 46, 51, 53, 82, 85, 87, 88, 162, 200, 255, 256
 Gregory XIII, 58, 59, 66
 Gregory the Illuminator, 38, 41
 Gregory of Nareg (See "Naregat'si")
 Guizot, 95
 Gümüşian, K., 188
 Gürjian, M., 145

H

- Hagop, 65
 Hagop (Catholikos), 61, 62
 Halévy, 110
 Halis River, 26
 Hamazasbian, K., 70
 Hamidian, 131, 132, 201 (See also "Abdul-Hamid")
 Harut'yunian, A., 250, 259
 Hat't'i Humayun, 91, 125

- Hat't'i Sherif of Gül Hanë, 91
 Hayg, 204
 Haygazian School, 166
 Haygazz, Diran, 36
 Hebrew, 146
 Hek'imian, S., 114, 199, 200, 202, 214
 Hellenic, 28, 29, 31, 34, 195
 Hellenism, 29, 41, 42, 48
 Hellenization, 36, 65
 Hellenized Asiatics, 30
 Herodotus, 26
 Hisarian, H., 107, 208, 311, 241, 242
 Hittite Empire, 27, 35
 Hinchagian Party, 132
 Holland, 69
 Holy Land, 55, 59
 Holy See, 83
 Hrant, 145, 218, 221, 245
 Hübschmann, H., 35
 Hugo, V., 95, 100, 106, 110 ff., 126, 157, 200 ff., 236, 240, 241, 253
 Humanitarian Association, 165
 Hungarians, 58
 Hungary, 86
 Hürmüz, K., 74, 199
 Hyrodes, 30

I

- Iberia, 42
 "Immoral literature," 180
 Imperial Ottoman Bank, 82, 182
 India, 69, 136, 261
 Indo-European, 35, 80
 Indo-Iranian, 35
 Infidels, 79
 Injijian, Fr., 73, 137, 152
 Iranian, 27, 32, 43, 49, 51
 Islam, 53
 Israel Ori, 62, 63
 Italian, 55, 60, 74, 92, 94, 96, 100, 104, 111, 126, 131, 155, 167, 205
 Italians, 89
 Italy, 34, 69, 89, 91, 94, 102, 167, 201 ff., 258

J

- Janissaries, 80, 82
 Jassv, 89
 Jemaran (at Scutari), 164

Jerusalem, 53, 83, 120, 121
 Jesuits, 40, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66
 Jews, 58, 81
 Jezairlian, Mgrdich Amira, 187
 Johann-Wilhelm, 62, 63
 Josselin I, 53
 Julfa, 61
 July Revolution, 89

K

Kadëk'eoy, 181
 Kadi, 82
 Kalusd (Patriarch), 68
 Kamañ-K'at'iba, 126
 Karabagh, 62
 Karakash, G., 114
 Karakashian, 73, 75
 Kazaz Art'in, 82, 163
 K'echian, P., 145, 179, 191
 K'elegian, D., 180
 Kevork (Patriarch), 188
 Khavaryalner (See "Obscurantists")
 Khotjamalian, T', 70
 Kharpert, 85
 Khorenat'si, Movses, 32, 73, 75,
 100, 127, 203 (See also "Moses
 of Khoren")
 Khrimian Hayrig, 124, 126, 128,
 129, 130, 131, 135, 145, 148, 215
 Kock, Paul de, 241
 Koran, 79
 Krapar, 69, 75, 84, 98, 103, 150,
 154, 155, 162, 189, 195
 Kraparian, 153
 Krikor Lusavorich (See "Gregory
 the Illuminator")
 Kum-Kap'u, 163
 Kurds, 128

L

La Bruyère, 226, 235
 La Fontaine, 157, 226
 La Malibran, 196
 Lamartine, 95, 100, 110, 126, 135,
 157, 178, 202, 205 ff., 213, 242
 "Language Quarrel," 153
 Latin, 34, 53 ff., 59, 60, 74, 227
 Latin Church, 39
 Latin Quarter, 139
 Latinization, 34, 56, 65

Latins, 57, 61, 63, 240
 Lazarian School, 90
 Lebanon, 125, 260
 Leconte de Lisle, 216
 Lemaitre, 196
 Lemberg, 198
 Leo II, 54, 56, 57, 66
 Leo VI, 56
 Leo X, 66
 Leopold of Austria, 62
 Lesser Armenia, 26, 35
 Levantine, 182
 Levon (See "Leo")
 Lévy, Michel, 168
 Literary theory, 240 ff.
 Littérature à tendance, 248
 Littré, 196, 258
 Liturgy, 44
 Locke, 70
 London, 90, 219
 Lord Nelson, 152
 Loti, 219, 226
 Louis XIV, 40, 59, 61, 62
 Lucullus, 31
 Lusavorchian Varzharan, 163
 "Lusavoryalner," (See "Enlight-
 ened")
 Lusignans, 56

M

Macedonian, 31
 Madras, 136
 Mahmud II, 82, 83, 90, 145, 167
 Mallarmé, 216
 Malot, 157
 Mamurian, M., 110, 126, 140, 155,
 156, 157, 217
 Manchester, 105
 Manzoni, 97
 Marcus Aurelius, 70
 Maria Comnena, 54
 Maronites, 58
 Marseilles, 60, 132
 Martasiragan School, 70
 Martin, H., 95
 Marzvan, 166
 Mat'evos (Patriarch), 115, 116
 Maupassant, 157, 216, 225, 227,
 232, 233 ff., 238, 246, 252
 Mazzini, 97, 126
 Medes, 27

Mediterranean, 28, 63, 64
 Medzarent's, M., 220, 252
 Mehemmed II, 83
 Mehemmed Ali P'asha, 88
 Melitene, 54
 Melkonian Institute of Cyprus, 174
 Mercedes, 143, 196
 Mesrob (Saint), 41, 43, 44, 163
 Mesrobian School, 108, 166, 169
 Metrodorus, 30
 Metternich, 89
 Michelet, 95, 96, 108, 147, 196, 203
 Middle Ages, 55
 Midhat P'asha, 110, 112
 Mirijanian, Mgrdich Amira, 163
 Mirijanian School, 169
 Misakian, K., 101, 103, 153, 211
 Missionaries, 37 ff., 51, 57, 59, 61, 64, 65, 68, 166, 180, 255
 Mithridates, 30, 31
 Mkhit'ar Herat'si, 150
 Mkhit'ar Sepasdat'si, 71, 72, 152
 Mkhit'arists, 70, 74, 96 ff., 126, 157, 164, 167, 196, 198, 199, 202, 214
 Mohammed, 79
 Mohammedanism, 49, 50, 55, 79
 Mohammedans, 40, 55, 56, 63, 66, 79, 80
 Moldavia, 89
 Molière, 100, 109, 157, 187, 198, 226
 Monasteries, 64, 65, 71
 Mongolian, 27
 Monophysitic, 83
 Montenegro, 131
 Montaigne, 258
 Montesquieu, 70, 213
 Montveller, 95
 Morality in literature, 248 ff., 251
 (See also "Décolleté literature")
 Moscow, 70
 Moses of Khoren, 32, 127 (See also "Khorenat'si")
 Moslems, 80, 81, 92, 256
 Mrmrian, 99
 Murad, S., 70, 112
 Murad-Rap'aelian School, 112
 Muradian School, 95, 110, 112, 166
 Musset, 95, 100, 110, 135, 157, 178, 179, 202, 205, 207

N

Nalbantian, 126
 Nalian (Patriarch), 69
 Nakhitjevan, 59
 Nancy, 95
 Napoleon, 88, 89
 Napoleon, Louis, 96
 Napoleonic, 88, 203
 Narbey, 114, 128, 188, 199, 202, 214
 Naregat'si, 73, 75, 100, 167
 Naregian School, 168
 National Assembly, 104, 120, 123, 125, 130, 134
 National Hospital, 120, 123 (See also "Armenian National Hospital")
 Naturalism, 196, 220, 245
 Near East, 49, 177
 Nero, 33
 Nerses (Catholikos), 42
 Nerses Shnorhali, 55
 Nersisian School, 70
 Nestorians, 83
 New Julfa, 59, 65
 Nicholas V, 66
 Nor Nakhitjevan, 151
 Norayr Püzantat'si, 158
 Normal School, 166
 North, literature of, 180, 247
 Norwegian, 247
 Nubarian, M., 158

O

"Obscurantists," 103, 116
 Odian, B., 106
 Odian, K., 96, 101, 102, 104, 105, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 124, 140, 153, 177, 202, 240, 242
 Odian, Y., 113, 220, 246
 Ordo Fratrum Unitorum, 58
 Oriental, 83, 89, 172
 Oriental Association, 165
 Oriental Theatre, 199
 Ormanian, 188
 Orpelian, 73, 75
 Ort'akügh, 187
 Orthodox Church, 39, 51
 Osman III, 81
 Osmanli, 34 (See also "Ottoman")

290 *French Influence on Western Armenian Renaissance*

Ottoman, 50, 80, 182
Ottoman Empire, 79, 84, 86, 88,
92, 94, 121, 147, 165, 167, 219

P

"P'adishah," 87
Padua, 95 ff., 99
Paghranian, M., 69
Pakraduni, Fr. A., 47, 54, 74, 168,
199
P'alakashian School for Girls, 169
Palatinate, 62
Papal, 62, 66
P'ap'azian, Janig Amira, 164
Paris, 60, 89, 95 ff., 100, 102 ff.,
108, 110, 117, 125, 147, 167, 175,
181, 185, 187, 202, 211, 219, 252
Parisian, 97, 104, 175, 252
Parnassian Achool, 196
Parthian, 29, 31, 33, 51
Pascal, B., 159, 167
Pashalian, L., 96, 214, 218, 219 ff.
224, 225, 245
P'ashalik', 81
P'asha, 80 ff., 100
P'avsdos Ptizant, 73, 75
Pehlevi, 43, 44, 51
Pera, 60, 71, 90, 181, 182, 199
Pergamum, 29
Persia, 28, 30, 33, 37, 38, 42, 59,
63, 65, 261
Persian, 27 ff., 32 ff., 39, 40, 42,
44, 46, 49 ff., 60, 63, 66, 151,
153, 170, 225
Persian Armenia, 50
Persian Gulf, 31
Peter the Great, 62, 63
Phrygians, 35
Piat, F., 201
Pius V, 66
Pléiade, 258
Plutarch, 29
Poetic mission, 240 ff., 251
Poland, 65, 261
Polojenié, 117
Pompey, 31, 32
Pontus, 26, 30, 31
Pope, 56, 57, 63, 72
P'ort'ukalian, M., 132
Prévost, Abbé, 190
Prometheus, 240
"Prot'est'an millet'i," 86, 134

Protestant, 83, 101, 137, 144, 151,
152, 162, 166, 169, 218, 258
Protestantism, 86, 144, 166
Proudhon, P.-J., 95
Provincial literature, 249 ff.

R

Rabelais, 258
Racine, 100, 157, 168, 227
Raffi, 126
Rāp'ael, Y., 70, 112
Rāp'aelian School, 112
Raya, 130
Realism, 196, 208, 214, 218, 220,
222, 224, 227, 243
Realist, 211, 212, 219, 224, 226,
227, 243, 252
Red Sultan, 40, 214
Religious Council, 116, 120, 122,
134, 164
Renaissance Generation, 97 ff., 101,
103, 104, 109, 110, 112, 114,
125, 126, 135, 160, 175, 177, 204
Renan, 196
Reshid P'asha, 91
Revolution of 1848-1849, 108
Richebourg, E., 190
Rimbaud, 216, 240
Robespierre, 119, 120, 133
Roman, 27, 31, 33, 36, 42, 57, 75,
255
Roman Empire, 31, 42
Romantic, 99, 101, 110, 177, 179,
202, 208, 210 ff., 215, 235, 242
Romanticism, 126, 203, 204, 208,
211, 214 ff., 242
Romanticist, 111, 140, 202, 206,
209, 214
Rome, 30, 31, 33, 34, 38, 58, 59,
63, 65
Roumania, 131, 261
Rousseau, 100, 196
Rubens, 243
Rūpen I, 53
Rūsinian, 101, 102, 104 ff., 109 ff.,
113, 117, 124, 125, 138 ff., 153,
164, 187
Russia, 63, 87, 88, 131, 261
Russian, 50, 52, 63, 88, 130, 147,
148, 170, 177, 247
Russian Armenia, 50, 144
Russo-Turkish War, 120

S

- Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, 58, 65
 Sahag (Catholikos), 41, 42, 44
 Saint Lazarus, 71, 126
 Saint Mesrob (See "Mesrob (Saint)")
 Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de, 241
 Sainte-Barbe, 96, 108, 176
 Sanasarian School, 166, 169, 171
 Sand, G., 157, 242, 243
 Saxony, 89
 Scepsis, 30
 School of the Illuminator, 163
 Scott, Sir Walter, 203
 Scribe, 182
 Scutari, 164
 Seleucia, 42
 Selucid, 29
 Seleucidan, 35
 Selim III, 87, 90, 162
 Seljuk Empire, 50
 Seljuk Turks, 34, 49
 Semitic, 43, 44
 Sepastia, 85
 Serbia, 131
 Serverian, 106
 Servichen, 104, 105, 114, 124, 140, 164
 Set'ian, H., 111, 114, 197, 214
 Sevan, 35
 Shah Abbas, 59
 Shahamirian, S., 69
 Shahnazar, H., 226
 Shakespeare, 200
 Shamdanjian, M., 181, 248
 Shishmanian, H., 114
 Shmavonian, Fr. H., 136, 137
 Shnorhali, 73, 75, 100, 197
 Siamant'o, 220, 252
 Silver Age, 97
 Simeon (Catholikos), 69
 Simon, J., 95, 96, 108
 Sis, 57, 83
 Slavic, 89
 Smyrna, 86, 90, 108, 110, 111, 137, 151, 152, 155, 157, 166, 169, 175, 180, 182
 Sorbonne, 95, 96, 138, 139, 147
 Spain, 89
 Spanish, 56, 60
 Spanish Succession, War of, 63
 Spencer, 258
 Srvantzyant's, K., 215
 Sublime Porte, 80, 117, 130, 218
 Sue, E., 95
 Suleiman the Magnificent, 86
 Summero-Akkadian, 35
 Süniat's Anabad, 71, 75
 Supreme Council, 116, 121, 138
 (See also "Civil Council")
 Surp Mesrob (See "Mesrob (Saint)")
 Svajian, Mrs., 220
 Svajian, H., 215
 Sweden, 63
 Switzerland, 89
 Sybille, 214
 Symbolism, 196, 238
 Symbolist, 235, 253
 Syria, 37, 125, 260
 Syriac, 41, 42, 44
 Syrian, 40, 41, 42, 45, 51

T

- Taine, 196, 216
 T'alet' P'asha, 135
 T'anizimat', 86, 91, 94, 98, 115, 125
 T'arkmanchat's School, 168
 Tatars, 27, 35, 39, 49
 Taurus (Armenian), 26, 53
 Tavit' Anghaght', 73, 75
 Tavit' Beg, 64
 T'ek'eian, 220, 252
 T'erzian, 99, 114, 126, 128, 169, 199, 200, 202, 204, 212, 214
 T'ghlian, 126, 168, 199, 200
 Theuriet, 190
 Thaddeus, 37
 Thiers, 95, 96
 Thrace, 27, 28, 55
 Tiflis, 70, 135, 144, 158
 Tigranes the Great, 29 ff., 256
 Tigranocerta, 29, 31
 Tiridates, 34, 38, 40, 41
 Tjakhtjakhian, 74
 T'lgadint'si, 219, 226, 248
 Tolstoi, 177
 Translation literature, 45, 47, 70, 74, 100, 108, 111, 142, 154 ff., 197, 198, 201, 202, 207, 216, 242
 Translators, 41, 48, 65, 95
 Translators' School, 168
 Troubadours, 55

292 *French Influence on Western Armenian Renaissance*

- Treaty of Berlin, 132, 216
 Treaty of Paris, 117, 125
 Treaty of San Stefano, 125, 130
 Turian, B., 99, 114, 128, 129, 178,
 199, 200, 203, 204, 206, 207
 Turin, 108
 Turkey, 52, 63, 86 ff., 94, 125, 128,
 131, 132, 144, 146, 168, 182,
 220, 249, 260, 261
 Turkish, 34, 53, 60, 63, 66, 68, 81,
 84, 87, 90, 91, 95, 100, 103, 107,
 111, 116, 118, 124, 125, 132,
 133, 140, 146, 149, 151, 152,
 153, 160, 162, 164, 170, 176,
 199, 206, 212, 219, 220, 226,
 258, 259
 Turkish Armenia, 50
 Turkish Empire, 91, 118, 183
 Turkomans, 49
 Turks, 27, 34, 35, 39, 40, 49, 50,
 51, 63, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 87,
 91, 94, 98, 102, 128, 130, 141,
 145, 180, 199, 219, 255
- U
- United Association, 174, 180
 Unitores, 58
 Urartian, 31, 35, 36
 Urartu, 27, 31, 35
 Urban VIII, 58
 Utilitarianism, 140, 141, 175, 176,
 215, 220, 241, 242, 251, 259,
 260
 Utüjian, G., 96, 101, 114, 138, 139,
 145, 148, 154, 157, 164
- V
- Van, 128, 132, 166, 173
 Vartan (Mamigonian), 204
 Vartan Vartabed, 55, 66
 Varuzhan, T., 220, 252
 Vasco da Gama, 70
 Venetians, 75, 198
 Venice, 65, 71, 96, 97, 99, 100,
 107, 112, 126, 137, 198, 202
- Verhaeren, 253
 Verlaine, 196, 252
 Vichenian, S., 104
 Vienna, 89, 137, 158
 Viennese, 75
 Vigny, 126, 157, 202, 205, 207, 240
 Vogue, E.-M. de, 247
 Voltaire, 100, 213, 227
 Vosgan, S., 96, 101, 105, 108, 141,
 169, 185
- W
- Waleran of Birijik, 53
 Wallachia, 89
 Warsaw, 89
 Western feudalism, 53 ff.,
- X
- Xenophon, 27, 28
- Y
- Yeghishê, 73, 75
 Yeni-cheris, 80
 Yerukhan, 237
 Yesayian, Z., 224, 237, 251, 252
 Yeznig, 73, 75
 Young Turks, 40, 92, 125, 132
- Z
- Zareh, 29
 Zariadres, 29 (See also "Zareh")
 Zartarian, R., 219, 248, 250
 Zeyt'un, 132, 206
 Zohrab, K., 145, 168, 171, 172, 175,
 201, 214, 217, 219, 221 ff., 230
 ff., 238, 243, 246, 248, 254
 Zola, E., 110, 142, 157, 171, 179,
 180, 190, 216, 227, 231, 232,
 233, 235, 242, 246, 252
 Zorayian, N., 101, 105, 140, 150
 Zoroastrianism, 46